COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume VIII SPRING 1956 Number 2

Love by the Book: Pushkin, Stendhal, Flaubert. By George Gibian..... 97

Ezra Pound's "Near Perigord": The Background of a Poem. By Thomas E. Connolly..... 110

Unamuno and Tennyson. By Anna Krause..... 122

New England in Lesya Ukrainka's *In the Wilderness*. By Clarence A. Manning..... 136

Browning's "Cleon" and Auguste Comte. By Edward C. McAleer..... 142

Book Reviews..... 146

Allgemeine Stilistik, by Herbert Seidler (Leo Spitzer). *The Poetry of Meditation*, by Louis L. Martz (Perry J. Powers). *Leicester, Patron of Letters*, by Eleanor Rosenberg (D. C. Allen). *The Development of American Literary Criticism*, ed. by Floyd Stovall (S. L. Goldberg). *Transatlantic Migration. The Contemporary American Novel in France*, by Thelma M. Smith and Ward L. Miner (George Reeves, Jr.). *The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville*, by Josephine W. Bennett (Philip W. (Souers). *The Contemporary French Novel*, by Henri Peyre (R .T. Sussex). *Three Elegies of Quintilius*, by Peter Russell (E. N. O'Neil). *Young Henry James: 1843-1870*, by Robert C. Le Clair (Robert C. Gordon). *Inspiration and Poetry*, by C. M. Bowra (Bernard Gicovate). *Poetica del Cinquecento*, by Galvano delle Volpe (Bernard Weinberg).

Varia..... 175

Books Received. Announcements.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the post office at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor
CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor
WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

FRANCIS FERGUSSON
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N. J.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N.Y.

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D.C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors —from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on comparative topics and on problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Complete back sets are available for sale or exchange. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Indexed in International Index to Periodicals.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME VIII SPRING 1956 NUMBER

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
AUG 18 1956
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

LOVE BY THE BOOK: PUSHKIN, STENDHAL, FLAUBERT

GEORGE GIBIAN

THE influence of literature on human conduct has been a matter of concern throughout the ages. *Werther* has been blamed for the wave of suicides which followed its publication; the *Aeneid* has received credit for prolonging the life of the Roman Empire. Plato's *Republic*, with its advocacy of control over the arts, is a classical example of preoccupation with extra-artistic effects of literature, as is half of Horace's injunction, the words *utile* and *prodesse*, in the lines "omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci" and "aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae." But it is not our purpose to amass examples of literature and art which have changed the world; that would fill a large volume, with quotations ranging from Plato through Wilde's claims that Whistler made London foggy and that nature follows art, rather than *vice versa*, to the latest discussions of whether tough talk became fashionable because Hemingway put it in the mouths of his characters, or whether the tough vogue came first and Hemingway merely reflected its existence.

If we narrow the subject to what books themselves say about the influence of books, the examples are still overwhelmingly numerous. The effect the reading of chivalric romances had on Don Quixote is the point of departure in a novel which has delighted generations of readers. A more favorable result, the immortalizing of the poet himself, has inspired poets from Horace (*Exegi monumentum*) to Petrarch, Ronsard, Shakespeare, Pushkin, Yeats, and others; and the immortalizing of the hero through the bard's song is shown in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* (Demodocus' lay), *Beowulf* (Hrothgar's thane's song of Sigemund and Beowulf), and the *Tale of Igor* (references to the bard Boyan).

But our concern here is with a narrower topic: how three works—*Eugene Onegin*, *Le Rouge et le Noir*, and *Madame Bovary*—show that

the reading of books molds the characters' concept of love and their feelings and behavior in affairs of the heart. We wish to consider what the varying treatments of this theme reveal about the differences between these three novels (*Onegin* is, after all, designated a "novel in verse" even by its own subtitle, and has exerted a great influence on the Russian prose novel) and possibly even about the differences between French and Russian realism in the nineteenth century. We shall omit consideration of other works by Pushkin, Stendhal, and Flaubert, and concentrate on the works which are richest in relevant material.

In all three books, the authors make a great deal of the influence of reading about love. They show concern with the differences between various kinds of love from period to period and from one social class to another, with discrepancies between literary representations of love and love as it really exists, and with the interplay between fictional accounts and love in actual life. All three discriminations are likely to result in an ironic view of life and in a realistic literary manner. Both irony and realism are of great moment in French and Russian literature of the nineteenth century.

In France there had existed, long before 1830, a tradition of the use of literary examples as models in actual love affairs and of deploring the consequences of reading romances or novels. La Rochefoucauld acknowledged the power of literature when he said there were many people who would never have known there was such a thing as love if they had not read about it in a book. Racine defended his Pyrrhus' conduct by writing in his first preface to *Andromaque*, "I admit that he is not sufficiently resigned to his mistress' will, and that Celadon knew perfect love better than he. But what can we do? Pyrrhus had not read novels; he was naturally violent, and not all heroes were meant to be Celadons."

In *Les Liaisons dangereuses*, Marquise de Merteuil and Vicomte de Valmont, both experienced strategists in amatory wars, find in books examples of possible tactics. The former writes: "I read a chapter of *Le Sopha*, a letter by Héloïse, and two fables by La Fontaine, in order to rehearse the different tones which I wanted to assume," when she is preparing to seduce Danceny. In similar circumstances, Danceny declares: "In vain I go over all the known methods, those of the novels and of my secret memoirs." Even though the resource of books as well as Valmont's own experience fail him in this instance, because he wants to do more than merely "make a new Clarissa of her," it is noteworthy that he should have to turn to books for guidance at all. His servant is also cunning enough to note, while spying on Madame de Tourvel, what she is currently reading (*Pensées chrétiennes* and *Clarissa*), for even he knows enough to realize that this information may reveal her frame of mind and thus prove useful to Valmont's purposes.

La Rochefoucauld, Racine, and Laclos, then, to mention only three prominent examples, assumed that love in practice was influenced deliberately or unconsciously by love in books, and that the course of natural love unaffected by literary models was likely to be quite different from the sophisticated variety based on literature.

Before we look at the studies of love and books by Stendhal and Flaubert, let us examine our Russian example, which comes first chronologically. *Eugene Onegin* was composed between the years 1823 and 1830. What does it say about the shaping of love by books? The heroine Tatyana is a simple girl raised in the country. Yet even she came under the spell of novels at an early age: "She fell in love with the deceits of Richardson and Rousseau" (II, 29).[1] Her father, who was not a reader himself, did not think any harm could come from her passion for books, and Pushkin makes it clear that the father's lack of concern was foolish. Her mother, on the other hand, like Tatyana, had loved Richardson; but, unlike her daughter, she had not read him, but only heard reports of his novels from a Moscow cousin—and her fondness for the English novelist was enhanced by her association of the name Grandison with a celebrated gambler and dandy.

Pushkin uses Tatyana's reading habits as a means of locating her in the pattern of changing attitudes of successive periods. Her mother's marriage is described as a typical example of the love life of the generation preceding Tatyana's. She was forced to marry by her family, wept after the wedding, was taken by her husband into the country, and only gradually became reconciled to the life of managing a household. Pushkin implies that, while it was to be expected that the mother's contemporaries should adore Richardson, Tatyana lagged behind the taste appropriate to her generation; her reading fits in with her rustic, isolated, old-fashioned upbringing, and contrasts with that of Onegin. On meeting the city sophisticate, the ideas Tatyana had acquired in romantic novels strengthen her feelings for him, and, in turn, the situation in which she finds herself encourages her to still more reading of books; for she can now more readily identify herself with Richardson's Clarissa, Rousseau's Julia, Madame de Staël's Delphine, and Onegin with Wolmar, Madame Cottin's Malek-Adhel (from *Mathilde et les croisades*), Madame de Krudner's de Linar (from *Valérie*), Grandison, and Werther. Her letter to Onegin reveals ideas of love molded by her reading of eighteenth-century literature. Onegin is a protector sent to

[1] The references in parentheses are to canto and stanza in *Yevgeny Onegin* (Moscow, 1949); the translations into English are mine. I am greatly indebted to several notes on the subject of this article in Dmitry Cizevsky's edition, *Evgenij Onegin* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953). References to, and quotations from, *The Red and the Black* are from the Modern Library edition (New York, 1926). References to *Madame Bovary* are to the Louis Conard edition (Paris, 1910); the translations are mine.

her by God; it is the will of Heaven that she be his; she had loved him even before she had seen him; feeling misunderstood and out of place in the country, she puts herself at his mercy, openly and without any defense—all commonplaces of the treatment of love in her favorite reading.

Tatyana's love is defined in contrast not merely with her mother's but also with that of another older woman, her nurse. Not only is the romantic concept of the early 1800s distinguished from that of the preceding generation, but also the book-nurtured view from that of the unread lower classes. The nurse, ignorant of the books Tatyana takes delight in, is frightened when the young girl confides her love to her; she considers such an emotion a symptom of illness and makes the sign of the cross over Tatyana. When Tatyana asks whether the nurse had ever been in love, she answers, "No, we never even heard about love," and explains that, in her time, peasant girls were married at thirteen after two weeks of negotiations with a marriage broker. Parents arranged all; it was in that sense that all was done as "God wished."

Reading is also a means of disclosing the character of Onegin, who looks down on Tatyana from the heights of his worldly experience, fails to see her good qualities, disillusions her coldly, and goes on to kill her sister's fiancé in a duel. Tatyana's eyes are not opened fully until after his departure, when she wanders through his house and comes to understand him through an examination of his library. Like a modern scholar studying marginalia in Melville's *Don Quixote* or Keats's Shakespeare in order to gain an understanding of the annotator's thought, she pores over the marks made by Onegin in the books after which he has patterned his life. The care lavished by Pushkin on this brief message is shown by the fact that we have four preparatory versions.

The first draft consists of an indiscriminate catalogue of books influential in Russia in the eighteenth century—mostly works of philosophers and moralists—which would have given but a slight and misleading glimpse of Onegin's character: "Hume, Robertson, Rousseau, Mably, Holbach, Voltaire, Helvetius, Locke, Fontenelle, Diderot, Lamotte, Horace, Cicero, Lucretius." The second version reads: "*Melmoth, René*, Constant's *Adolphe*, and two or three other novels." Here we are coming closer to Onegin's view of himself—a mixture of the diabolism of Maturin, who was very popular in Germany and Russia (so much so that De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* was passed off in Russia under Maturin's name, since he was famous and De Quincey unknown), the romantic, fate-driven, morbidly brooding hero of Chateaubriand, and Constant's weary creation. The third version does not mention the novelists by name, relegating them (or their like) to anonymity and substituting Byron: "the creator of the worthless Juan, and Scott and two or three novels." The fourth, in a separate

printing of this chapter of *Eugene Onegin*, reads: "the creator of Manfred and Juan."[2] The final version, "the poet of Giaour and Juan, and two or three novels," supported by a reference to Byron's portrait on the wall of Onegin's room, completes the switch from French and Irish romanticism to the Byronic.

By reading Onegin's books, Tatyana comes to understand his motives and the differences between her own outlook, formed by her country breeding and the romantics of the eighteenth century, and that of Onegin, shaped by the literature of a more recent literary school, with its development of the hero into a tired figure "with an immoral soul, self-loving and dry, addicted to boundless dreaming, with an embittered mind, boiling over in empty activity" (VII, 22). In his books Tatyana learns "by what thoughts and observations Onegin used to be impressed, and with what he tacitly agreed" (VII, 23). She wonders at the enigma of this creature and asks herself whether he was "a sad, dangerous oddity, a creation of Hell or Heaven, an angel or a conceited devil? What is he? An imitation, an unreal apparition, or a Moscow man in Childe Harold's cloak, a commentary on foreign whims, a dictionary full of fashionable words? Or a parody?" (VII, 24).

Unlike Emma Bovary, then, Pushkin's heroine achieves knowledge of her situation and of Onegin's character; through experience of life and books, she rises above books, and from her vantage point can judge with a clear head her own error as well as the full tragedy of Eugene Onegin. In the poem the works of Byron and other romantics reveal to one character how another character destroyed his own identity by becoming a living pseudo-Byronic shadow. A derivative and unreal creature, Onegin is the verdict passed by Pushkin on the whole romantic generation which included Byron himself. In an aside typical of Pushkin's ironic, topical digressions, he expands his indictment of literary taste: "Now all minds are in a fog; a moral puts us to sleep; we like vice in a novel, and vice is triumphant in it. The fictions of the British muse disturb the sleep of the young girl; these have become her idols: the brooding Vampire, or Melmoth, a somber wanderer, or the Eternal Jew, or the Corsair, or the mysterious Sbogar [Charles Nodier's *Jean Sbogar*]. Lord Byron has, through successful caprice, clothed even hopeless egoism in depressed romanticism" (III, 12).

Tatyana grows in stature; when she meets Onegin again, after his wanderings, he is still the same, unless he be even emptier and more of a "superfluous man." Tatyana is completely genuine and fully aware of her own position as a prince's wife and social success in Moscow: but, when Eugene Onegin in his turn falls in love with her, his love, the best of which he is capable, is still imitative and synthetic. Now it is he who is cast in the role of the beseecher and who writes a love letter,

[2] Cizevsky, *Evgenij Onegin*, p. 276.

which is, however, self-centered and reminiscent of Adolphe, and implies confidence that Tatyana will be overjoyed to receive it. When they meet and she makes her great renunciation of Onegin, though admitting that she still loves him, her action contrasts with Onegin's spurning of her at their earlier encounter in the country—just as her letter compares favorably with his. Even in the dénouement, Pushkin resorts to a survey of Onegin's reading to define his state of mind. Indiscriminateness is the chief characteristic of his selection of books: Gibbon, Rousseau, Manzoni, Herder, Chamfort, Madame de Staël, Fontenelle, Pierre Bayle, medical authors, magazines, and almanacs (VIII, 35). He has failed to establish order in his life, and Pushkin abandons him, an exposed, empty, shattered, weary romantic—but far from a romantic hero—who is about to embark on his travels. Fragments of later books give no clear indication whether he was to die in the army or meet some other end.

Eugene Onegin, then, remains a vain figure. His reading of Byron, Constant, and others merely intensified his unprepossessing natural leanings; his later contacts with books also failed to help him find a way to become a genuine person. Tatyana in the last scene is a fullblown version of her former self. Her early reading of romantic literature did not really mislead her; she adopted some of its views on love, but on the whole succeeded in transcending it. Her love, based as it was on an erroneous impression of Onegin and fomented by her books, survived even after she learned from his conduct—and from his library—what he really was. The seemingly romantic and borrowed views in her letter, then, prove to be genuinely hers. Truthfulness and straightness are her most important traits at the outset and at the end. She is innately noble, both in her delusion in the village and later in her clear-sightedness in the city when she perceives the sham of court life. She still values her early life and her love for Onegin; but she displays no sentimental melancholy at the end, nor does she jeer at him or in any other way take advantage of their changed positions. She rejects him, yet speaks, and feels, matter-of-factly, directly, and simply. Neither dejected nor delighted by her fate, she accepts the obligations and privileges of the life she has assumed.

Pushkin uses his characters' reading as a cogent means of defining Onegin, Tatyana, and her parents in relation to each other. Books are potential corruptors, as well as sources of insight; they overpower only a weakling, and can be used to advantage even by a somewhat old-fashioned country girl—if she has the strong character which Pushkin admires. Pushkin's realism exposes the ideals of romantic literature, distinguishes between the group headed by Rousseau and Richardson and that of Byron and Constant, and places full self-awareness and genuineness above the ideals of either.

In Stendhal's *Le Rouge et le Noir*, literature is first of all important to Julien as a link with the age of Napoleon. His favorite reading as a boy was Las Cases' *Memorial de Sainte-Hélène* (I, 28, 31); this literary monument to Napoleon added to his contempt for the period in which he was condemned to live and to his yearning for the age when, he believed, a man of any social origin, if aggressive and competent, could rise to great heights, develop his individuality freely, and live heroically and vigorously. It was the knowledge of books which also helped him to climb the ladder of social success. His learning impressed the Bishop of Besançon, who presented him with a set of Tacitus; but it could also trip him, as when he was tricked into revealing his admiration for Horace and Virgil instead of limiting himself to ecclesiastical literature. When he rises still higher, at the home of the Marquis de La Môle, he realizes that here his knowledge of Horace, Martial, and Tacitus can be of advantage to him, but that he is still lacking in another qualification necessary at this point of France's cultural spiral: he "could make nothing of all these modern names, such as Southey, Lord Byron, George IV, which he now heard for the first time" (II, 30).

Far more than Pushkin, Stendhal uses books to delineate the cultural and social stratification, within the church and outside, of which he disapproves. In the France of his day, as one moved from country to city, from abbé to bishop, and from provincial mayor to Parisian nobleman, there was great variation in reading approval and disapproval. Differences in social manners, clothes, and books are the flesh and blood of Stendhal's novel. To Julien books are tools which he exploits for his own advancement; but, while they are as it were the Icarus' wings which lift him above his age and milieu, they are also an artificial crutch; at those moments when Stendhal admires his conduct most, Julien discards the guidance of books and behaves naturally and spontaneously, looking for directions only to his own heart.

Stendhal also uses books as determinants of love. Julien, like Tatyana, read Rousseau (*The Confessions*) at an early age; yet both he and Madame de Rênal are at least temporarily hampered by ignorance of the amatory lessons of literature in bringing their love to its consummation. Stendhal comments: "In Paris love is the child of the novels. The young tutor and his timid mistress would have found in three or four novels or even in the lyrics of the Gymnase [the Paris theater, Gymnase-Dramatique] a clear statement of their situation. The novels would have outlined for them the part to be played, shown them the model to copy; and this model, sooner or later, albeit without the slightest pleasure, and even with reluctance, vanity would have compelled Julien to follow" (I, 53-54).[3] Julien relies on a mixture of calculation, cunning, emotion, and instinct, and, when he leans on the last two, he succeeds.

[3] Stendhal's other works occasionally refer to the interplay between education, literature, society, and love. See *Nouvelles inédites*, p. 33: "Her deep study in the

Books are very important in shaping the ideals of Mathilde de La Môle, who dreams of the courage of the men of Napoleon's days and of her ancestors, among them one woman who caressed the decapitated head of a lover. She admires the pride and "cunning of this little plebeian" (II, 108), and decides she is in love with him only after turning over in her mind "all the descriptions of passion which she had read in *Manon Lescaut*, the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, the *Letters of a Portuguese Nun*, and so forth" (II, 109). Julien plans and schemes; he repeats to her passages from the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, embraces her when he feels the moment demands it, and speaks when the game of love as set down in books requires it. She follows suit: "Mathilde, throughout the whole of her conduct with him, had been performing a duty" (II, 149). Her letter to him and Julien's reaction upon receiving it are something out of a play, not the outgrowth of sincere passion. For her it is a grand gesture in the manner of her ancestors, for him the sign of success in being loved by a noblewoman. Julien sends Mathilde's letter away for safekeeping in order to protect himself against any eventuality. He carries on a protracted correspondence in which he copies a collection of love letters and sends them to another woman, for the sake of the effect this will have on Mathilde, a crowning piece of calculation and indirection, through which Stendhal drives home the spuriousness of Julien's conduct and the artificiality of the society in which he lives.

It is within that society that Julien attempts to rise, succeeds, and then finally fails through his spontaneous, immediate reaction to Madame de Rênal's intervention and denunciation; yet as a person he is at his highest exactly when his fortunes are the lowest. He himself recognizes the superiority of integrity when he thinks of the nobility of his friend Fouqué, who offered to sell all his property in order to bribe the gaoler to let Julien escape:

> How many savings, how many little cheese-parings, which made me blush so when I saw him make them, he is willing to sacrifice for me! None of those fine young fellows whom I used to see at the Hotel de La Môle, who read *René*, would have any of his absurdities; but apart from those of them who are very young and have inherited fortunes, as well, and know nothing of the value of money, which of those fine Parisians would be capable of such a sacrifice? [II, 292].

Stendhal's novel is the story of an individual out of place in his society; his natural talent, knowledge, and ambition are out of proportion to his station. The social and cultural furnishings, which include

convent of Philothée and the *Imitation* had the effect of making her understand and read with delight certain sections of *Princesse de Clèves*, Marivaux' *Marianne*, and the *Nouvelle Héloïse*"; quoted in Henry Delacroix, *La Psychologie de Stendhal* (Paris, 1918), p. 103. Delacroix's study devotes a long chapter (pp. 82-188) to Stendhal's psychology of love, without, however, discussing the topic of this article. Valuable sources of information are Stendhal's *Journal* and his *De l'Amour*. Paul Kluckhohn, *Die Auffassung der Liebe in der Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts und der deutschen Romantik* (Halle, 1922), gives a useful survey of the views of love in Europe in the period immediately preceding.

books, are prominent throughout the novel, because Stendhal believes they are of overriding importance in reality, in the world whose superficiality and derivativeness he pillories in *Le Rouge et le Noir*. The great difference between this novel and *Eugene Onegin* is that, when Julien finally does become spontaneous and genuine and rises above his social milieu and the influence of books, when, to use the terminology of Stendhal's "moral geology," the bottom layer of rock, which is Julien's true nature, crops up through the accumulated layers of manners, habits, and reading, then he must die—and so does Madame de Rênal. No *modus vivendi* is possible with the France of 1830. But in Pushkin's poem Tatyana lived on with her general, even though Onegin was still alive. Pushkin also dealt satirically and in great detail with books and social trappings, but he did not primarily attack society and the age; rather he glorified the strength of Tatyana. His depiction of love by the book is subservient to that of the moral choices of the individual character.

Emma Bovary is a more radically deluded person than either Onegin or Julien Sorel. Her horrible death by eating arsenic out of a bowl is characteristic of her life. Her self-deception began with dreams of bamboo huts (in *Paul et Virginie* manner) during her "beautiful education" by Ursuline sisters. She lives on thoughts of "loves, lovers, persecuted ladies fainting in lonely pavilions . . . gentlemen brave as lions, gentle as lambs, virtuous as nobody ever was, always well dressed, and who weep like fountains" (pp. 50-51). The reading of Walter Scott, *Héloïse*, and various romantic works of fiction and history stimulates reveries of "a knight with a white plume galloping on a black horse," while music inspires her with thoughts of "little angels with golden wings, madonnas, lagoons, and gondoliers" (pp. 51-52).

Her reading is much like Mathilde de La Môle's and Tatyana's; but it has more of a historical bent than the Russian heroine's, and the dreams which it calls forth are far more remote from her actual life than those of either Tatyana or Mathilde. Emma lives in a lower—drab, mediocre, bourgeois, provincial—environment, and she herself is a woman inferior to Mathilde, not to mention Tatyana. Mathilde could at least establish a relation between her reading and the heroic, ambitious, equally book-inspired Julien; in her family's aristocratic life she found a latter-day counterpart to her historical yearnings. Tatyana's reading was merely an outward veneer which did not affect her capacity to live, see, and love truly. But Emma's surroundings, as well as character, are second-rate. Hence her dreams, fed on nothing but themselves, grow to fantastic size. Rodolphe, a most unlikely person on whom to pin one's hopes for escape from Yonville life, exploits her misplaced romanticism, but is disconcerted when the same romanticism leads her to ask him whether he owns a pair of dueling pistols.

The reverberation of literary parallels gives glamor to Emma's

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE LIBRARY AUG 18 1956 MANHATTAN KA

adulterous relations with Rodolphe: "She recalled the heroines of the books she had read, and the lyrical legion of these adulteresses began to sing in her memory with the voices of sisters who charmed her. She herself became as it were a real part of these imaginings and translated into reality the long dreams of her youth" (pp. 225-226). Her reading blinds her to Rodolphe's true nature and leads her to expect the impossible from her relationship with him. But the same romantic illusions which made her an easy victim begin to prey on him; when she—still following the novelistic pattern—begins to urge and plan an elopement, Rodolphe leaves brusquely and most unromantically. The elopement she also envisaged as conforming to her reading: "Galloping behind four horses, she would be carried off . . . to a new land from which they would never return. They would walk, arm in arm, without speaking. Often, from the top of a mountain, they would suddenly notice some splendid city with domes, bridges, ships, groves of lemon trees and cathedrals of white marble . . . They would go for rides in gondolas, swing in hammocks" (pp. 271-272).

The religious phase through which Emma passes after the illness caused by the jilting is similar to her romantic vagaries in its extravagance, emotionality, and vague, unfocused excess. But now religious books replace Walter Scott and Rousseau; and visions of God, saints, and seraphic harps replace those of gondoliers, lovers, and palm huts.

Just as Stendhal stresses the stimulus given to the development of love by music and balls,[4] so Flaubert shows Emma becoming entangled in her second love affair through the catalytic help of an opera, *Lucia di Lammermoor*. The music recalls to her the youthful reading of Scott; and, as it evokes amatory reveries, it also reminds her of her husband's crudeness and insensitivity shown in his obtuse questions about the opera (p. 311). It is through him, too, that she is led to meet again with Leon, who, in contrast to Charles Bovary, is able to talk of music very impressively. The ensuing love affair with Leon recapitulates the course of her liaison with Rodolphe. Emma is described as the "mistress of all the novels, the heroine of all the dramas, the vague *she* of all volumes of verse" (p. 367).

Homais' discovery that the boy Justin was surreptitiously reading the illustrated book, *L'Amour conjugal*, is merely an ironic footnote underlining both the role played by books dealing with love in the life of Emma and the unhappy state of the Bovarys' marital relations. Emma's visions assume their final form in her immersion in the magic of the priest's last rites. The language in which Flaubert describes the priest's recital of *Misereatur* and *Indulgentiam* and the anointment of her eyes, nostrils, mouth, hands, and the soles of her feet recalls her former sensual loves. Her ecstasy is related explicitly to her earlier religious enthusiasms:

[4] See especially *De l'Amour*, ch. 13.

"She turned her face slowly and seemed overjoyed on suddenly seeing the violet stole, doubtless finding in the midst of an extraordinary decrease of her pain the lost voluptuousness of her first mystical transports, with the visions of eternal beatitudes which were beginning" (p. 446). Flaubert does not allow us to forget that her torment was composed of a series of metamorphoses, of alternating dreams of love and religion, linked by their saturation with the life of the senses and by their common source in literary and artistic stimuli. Even in this last ecstasy, however, in keeping with the line of development of her previous delusions in her marriage and the affairs with Rodolphe and Leon, Emma finds herself cheated—the ecstasy turns into the agony of death.

Flaubert's use of the motif of love by the book cuts both ways, against books and against the reality of narrow provincial life. In *Madame Bovary* there are no heroes, as there are in *Eugene Onegin* and *Le Rouge et le Noir*. In all three works, there is an interplay between social environment, books, and character. In Pushkin the weight of social environment seems the least; the characters enjoy the greatest freedom and reach the clearest and deepest self-knowledge. In Stendhal, the heroic character defies an almost engulfing milieu, even (and most conspicuously) when he goes down in defeat. In Flaubert the deluge of meanness and impossible dreams crush a woman who lacks heroism, genuineness, and insight. She comes closest to a moment of illumination in her outburst in the last interview with Rodolphe, but even then her view is limited and temporary, a flash surrounded by darkness.

The influence of books is neutral for Tatyana (since she assimilates and overcomes it); mixed for Julien (meretricious when Rousseauistic, favorable when Napoleonic); destructive for Emma (whom it incapacitates for life). Significantly not one of the three authors fully approved of the influence of books—which are a concentrated representation of the period's pressure on the individuals living in it.

Pushkin's, Stendhal's, and Flaubert's heavy reliance on the theme of the influence of books is related to three concerns which they have in common. The first is the complexity of social structure. All three writers are preoccupied with differences of social standing and with the manner by which the distinctions are enforced. In all three we find serious treatment of the individual's maladjustment within the society of his day and his struggle against it. This brings us to their important innovation in fiction—their sense of historical development. Our authors realize, and show by their concern with the theme of love by the book, that as time passes social criteria change, that the reading of yesterday does not fit the life of today, that the social structure undergoes constant development, and that its mutations, as well as the individual's gyrations within, it may and ought to be treated by the writer seriously and problematically.

The second quality which they have in common is the awareness of the multitude of factors which make the individual what he is—inclination, innate character, upbringing, parents' or nurse's or husband's guidance, the social class to which he or she belongs, reading, all the numerous things which "the age demands." They picture man as a creature who forms an ideal image of what he would like to be. The factors which guide him are many, but our authors show that in their age literary influences were very powerful in the construction of that image. This may be due historically to the emergence of a large literate group which is supplied with a literature dealing with the details of a life similar to its own. The works of Richardson, Rousseau, Constant, and their fellows presented bourgeois and lower-upper-class characters with a new complex and incisive psychological analysis. Hence more interest was taken in their characters, and these characters influenced more persons in their lives.

The manner in which the three writers treat the problem differs, of course. The latest, Flaubert, is the most negative, showing with the perfection of cool impersonality his disgust with small-town life and with the romantic dream. In Stendhal, the social distinctions are the most rigid; the ambitious young man's path is strewn with the most obstacles. Yet Stendhal finds what he thinks is a positive value, the attempt at self-assertion. Flaubert, at least in *Madame Bovary*, shows no longing to return to any past period, and Bovarysme is a negative, passive self-delusion, whereas Beylisme is in any event an active effort. Pushkin displays the least rancor. The society which he describes in *Eugene Onegin* is less firmly set in its ways; the scope of self-determination afforded to the individual is the broadest. Pushkin also has the most sympathy and the least irony, which is an inevitable result of pondering the merry-go-round of social change and the drama of the individual's enmeshment in it. *Eugene Onegin* may well exemplify a quality distinctive of Russian realism as compared with the French; Pushkin tries to see life as it is, clearly and without idealization, yet accepts it with the matter-of-factness of Ilya Muromets' death in the *bylina*, and accompanies the steady look by moral admiration for the individual who stands his ground and sees the truth both inside and outside of himself. The poem favors acceptance without resignation.

The three authors supply us with a wealth of examples of the influence of books on love and on character. But, in refutation of the lion who commented on the many paintings of victorious hunters with their dead quarries, "If lions could only paint," our writers give an unflattering account of the influence exerted by their predecessors' productions. The works we have examined evidently show symptoms of the increasing self-consciousness and negativity of the modern writer. The treatment of love by the book signalizes the crossing of a landmark, the full bloom

of literature aware of itself, of social complexity, social change, the individual's shaping by social milieu and his culture, and the interplay between the values of society and the individual.

Smith College

EZRA POUND'S "NEAR PERIGORD": THE BACKGROUND OF A POEM

THOMAS E. CONNOLLY

THE Provençal troubador Bertran de Born fascinated Ezra Pound, directly or indirectly inspiring several of his poems and attracting his critical attention. "Near Perigord," which appeared in *Lustra* in 1915, is an attempt by Pound to plumb the hidden depths of the boisterous, twelfth-century, fighting baron-poet. But the reader who has not made a study of the poets of Provence and the history of the turbulent times in which they lived has little chance of enjoying the full pleasure of this excellent work. And even the reader who has a firsthand knowledge of Provençal poetry may need an introduction to the other writings of Pound on this subject. In "Near Perigord," Pound has succeeded in breathing the spirit of life once more into a man who otherwise might have remained a dim figure in history. The way in which he resurrects Bertran de Born is interesting; he does it through an examination of one of Bertran's own poems, and, in attempting to discover the poetic motivation, he reveals the living complexities of the man behind the poem.

Pound divides his poem into three parts and, using a technique reminiscent of Browning's *The Ring and the Book,* examines first the historical facts of the case. Then, discarding history, he lets his imagination play about the character of Bertran and tries to recreate the personality of the man in a fictional passage that ends with a debate between two of his contemporaries. Finally, he abandons both unsuccessful methods and attempts a dramatic presentation from the point of view not of Bertran, nor of his male companions, nor of the poet, but of the lady to whom Bertran addressed his poem.

The epigraph for "Near Perigord" is an excerpt from one of Bertran's war songs (*sirventes*). Pound has given a translation of this part of the poem in his essay, *The Spirit of Romance* (p. 40):

> At Perigord near to the wall
> Aye, within a mace throw of it,
> I will come armed upon Baiart, and if I find there
> that fat-bellied Poitevin,
> He shall see how my brand cuts.
> For upon the field I will make a bran-mash of his brains,
> mixed with the "maille" (*i.e.* the little
> round discs of his armour).

This, then, is our introduction to the character of Bertran de Born. He was born shortly before the middle of the century (1135-40?) and lived

to see that century close (died ca. 1207). He could, in the best troubador tradition, write a canzone in honor of a lady, but at the same time he was one of the most warlike barons of the age. Restless and ill at ease during periods of peace, his entire life seems to have been dedicated to stirring up wars in and about Provence.

The framework of "Near Perigord" is quite simple; Pound takes one of Bertran's love poems (the "fine canzone") and asks the question: Was it really a love poem, or was it merely a device by which Bertran could send his jongleur to a number of castles in order to spy on the forces opposing him and thus map out a battle plan for one of his wars?

After the initial four lines in which a fictional Cino (revealed as such to the author in a message from E. P.) asks about Bertran de Born and is referred to the Provençal troubador and biographer of other troubadors, Uc St. Circ, the love song is introduced, and we are given a paraphrased quotation from it. The song is Bertran's "Dompna pois de me no'us cal," a translation of which was made by Pound.[1] Bertran addressed the poem to the Lady Maent (or Maeut) de Montaignac. He had been in competition for her favor with many other men, among whom were such distinguished rivals as Richard Cœur de Lion, Geoffrey Plantagenet, his brother, Alphonso, king of Aragon, and Raymond, count of Toulouse. A further complication to Bertran's suit—although never a serious obstacle to love in those days—was the fact that Lady Maent was already the wife of Tairiran (who is mentioned in the poem).

Something of Bertran's personal appeal may be judged from the fact that, despite this formidable array of competitors, he was successful in his suit. (An earlier love campaign had won him the favorable notice of Princess Helen, sister of Richard.) For a time their love was peaceful enough, but a lady, Guiscarde de Camborn, attracted Bertran's attention by writing some verses in praise of him. Not to be outdone, he returned the compliment by addressing songs to her. Such an old campaigner should have known that this was not the way to keep his Lady Maent. She dismissed him from her favor and banned him from her presence. It was at this time that Bertran composed his "Dompna soissenbuda" (The Borrowed Lady). Seeking to console himself for the loss of his lady and hoping to win her back by this method of indirect praise, he composed a song in which he "seeks to make a 'borrowed' or ideal lady; to which end, he, in this song, begs from each pre-eminent lady of Provence some gift, or some fair quality: thus, of Anhes, her hair golden as Ysolt's; of Cembelins, her love-lit glance; of Aelis, her speech free-running; of the Viscountess of Chales, her throat and her two hands; of Bels-Miralhs (Fair-Mirror), her gaiety, and so on."[2]

[1] *Personae, The Collected Poems of Ezra Pound* (New York, 1949), p. 105.
[2] E. Pound, *Spirit of Romance* (London and New York, n.d.), p. 42.

The second verse-stanza of Pound's poem incorporates all this.[3] But it goes on to introduce the basic conflict of the poem: "for every lady a castle, / Each place strong." Is the plan of warfare already forming in the crafty brain of Bertran? Or is this really a serious love poem in which he strives to rouse the jealousy, and consequently revive the love, of Maent? The rest of the first part is devoted to a debate of this question.

The third section (lines 15-46) gives an account of a war that Bertran stirred up and eventually lost, together with his castle Altafort (Hautefort). Tairiran, husband of Maent, held the castle at Montaignac; it flanked Bertran's and therefore threatened his defense. Tairiran's brother-in-law (his brother, according to Stimming) was the count of Perigord, and together they made an almost unbeatable combination for the control of the area. Bertran, caught in the middle on an unprotected and exposed rise ("great mountain of a palm"), unlike the other castles which surrounded him and were situated in places of natural protection, had no choice but to fight his way out.

Reference to Dante throws light on the "four brothers" and the "old king" mentioned toward the end of this section. Dante placed Bertran de Born in the ninth ring of Hell among the "sowers of scandal and schism" for the part he played in stirring up wars between Henry II of England and his four sons. The passage in the *Inferno* occurs in Canto XXVIII, lines 118-142. Bertran's punishment was to have his head severed from his body and to be forced to carry it like a lantern:

> E il capo tronco tenea per le chiome
> pesol con mano a guisa di lanterna,
> e quel mirava noi, e dicea: "Oh me!"
>
> Di sè faceva a sè stesso lucerna,
> ed eran due in uno, ed uno in due;
> com'esser può, quei sa che sì governa.

The last words that Bertran de Born addresses to Dante are: "Thus the law of retribution is observed in me." This is the "counterpass" (*contrapasso*) of Dante, the matching of the punishment with the crime; Bertran who divided brothers against each other and sons against father is condemned to division of himself—"two in one, and one in two" (see epigraph of Part II).

Bertran was constantly embroiled in the warfare in France involving the four sons of Henry II of England. Henry, known as "the young king" because he had been crowned as heir to the throne on June 15, 1170 at Westminster, was governor of Anjou and Maine; Richard was duke of Aquitaine and Poitou and later King Richard I of England;

[3] H. J. Chaytor, *The Troubadours of Dante* (Oxford, 1942), pp. 141-142 identifies almost all the ladies from whom Bertran "borrowed" qualities for his ideal lady. Chaytor is most helpful throughout for Pound's Provençal poems.

Geoffrey died before accession; and John Lackland was later King John of England; these were the four brothers that Bertran de Born stirred up to almost constant warfare. "Pawn your castles, lords! / Let the Jews pay"—a favorite tactic of Bertran. If he borrowed money on his castle to finance a war and won, the conqueror could pay it back out of the profits of the war; if he lost, his enemy got the mortgage along with the castle. Chaytor gives an excellent account of the activities which earned for Bertran Dante's label of "stirrer-up of strife."

> Richard refused to do homage to his brother Henry after the coronation of 1170, on the ground that as duke of Aquitaine he was a vassal of the French king. The brothers quarreled about the possession of the castle of Clairvaux and the Aquitainian barons, who hated Richard, had offered to secure the dukedom for Henry, if he would support a rebellion for that purpose. By the end of 1182 this tension had reached the breaking point. The young king accepted the proposal of the Aquitainian barons and formed a league with Geoffrey to drive Richard out of his possessions. Bertran joined Henry's party; he seems to have had a real liking for the generous and pliable young king and a strong dislike of the gusty temper and violent methods of Richard... War began; Henry invaded Poitou and Aquitaine and Richard could not make head against his superior numbers. But the king intervened with an army from England and forced the brothers to make peace; he settled the dispute concerning the castle of Clairvaux by taking possession of it himself. So sudden a termination of a promising uproar was far from satisfactory to Bertran...
>
> The peace was of no long duration. The revolted barons would not recognise a convention concluded without consideration of their interests. The league was revived, but upon this occasion Henry and Geoffrey turned against their father. Bertran again joined them...
>
> The young king caught enteric fever and died in the castle of Martel on June 11, 1183, aged 29. His death was deeply felt by Bertran who was attached to him by affection as well as self-interest.[4]

"Beaten at last..." On June 29, 1183, after the death of the young king, Richard joined with the king of Aragon and came to pay off his score against Bertran for fighting with Henry against him. Hautefort fell after a week, and Bertran was dispossessed. The castle was given to his brother Constantine (though it eventually came back to Bertran). Chaytor has pointed out[5] that the story that Henry II was present and pardoned Bertran after he made a touching reference to the death of his son is apocryphal. The king of England was not present.

Has the true man been revealed? Did he love the lady? Or did he merely see the advantage of a strong castle that history has for centuries proved to be defensible?

The next passage (lines 53-68) carries forth the assumption that "Dompna soissenbuda" was actually a plan of campaign. The names

[4] H. J. Chaytor, *The Troubadours and England* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 41-43.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

Chalais, Rochecouart, Malemort, are the names of the castles which correspond to the ladies mentioned in the poem.

> "Papiol,
> Go forthright singing . . ."

Papiol was the jongleur who sang the songs that Bertran composed; he is addressed directly in this fashion in several of Bertran's poems. The rest of the lines in quotation marks are a paraphrase of the "Dompna."

The final passage contains only two obscure allusions which require clarification:

> (St. Leider had done as much as Polhonac,
> Singing a different stave, as closely hidden.)

Pound himself has thrown light on this passage in his essay, "Troubadours—Their Sorts and Conditions," in *Make It New* (p. 24):

> No student of the period can doubt that the involved forms, and the veiled meanings in the "trobar clus," grew out of living conditions, and that these songs played a very real part in love intrigue and the intrigue preceding warfare. The time had no press and no theatre. If you wish to make love to women in public, and out loud, you must resort to subterfuge: and Guillaume St. Leider even went so far as to get the husband of his lady to do the seductive singing.

A more detailed version of the story is given by Nostredame, who uses the name St. Desdier. I have translated the French for convenience:

> William St. Desdier was a wealthy gentleman of the country of Vellay, an honorable man, a good knight at arms, generous and liberal, well educated and very courtly, well liked and accepted by all classes of people; [he] was in love with the Marchioness of Poulignac, sister of Nassal of Claustral, in whose praise William composed many beautiful and pretty songs. He addressed her by the secret name of My Bertran, the same name which he had given to one of his intimate companions, Hugh Mareschal. To this Bertran [the wife] the said William addressed his songs, in order not to arouse the suspicion of the Marquis, her husband. She happily accepted the secret mate-name Bertran which William called her. Hugh Marsechal, knowing all the secrets of William and the Marchioness, then tried to have him driven from the court of the Marquis, thinking by this means to take the place of William with respect to the Marchioness; but she, seeing the rashness and the dishonesty of Hugh Mareschal, charged him with having received her revenue on one of her estates, where he was killed by the peasants of the estate, one does not know why; however, William retired to Provence to the service of Alphonso, King of Aragon, Count of Provence, which was about the year 1185, at which time he died.

Another "precedent" for the interpretation that Bertran disguised preparation for war as an innocent love song is given in the poetry of another troubador, Count Foix. Here again, Pound supplies the clue to the lines in the essay "Troubadours—Their Sorts and Conditions" (p. 32):

> In a very different key we find the sardonic Count of Foix, in a song which begins mildly enough for a spring song:

"Mas qui a flor si vol mesclar,"

and turns swiftly enough to a livelier measure:

"Ben deu gardar lo sieu baston
Car frances sabon grans colps dar
Et albirar ab lor bordon [Italics mine]
E nous fizes in carcasses
Ni en genes ni en gascon."

"Let no man lounge amid the flowers
Without a stout club of some kind.
Know ye the French are stiff in stour
And sing not all they have in mind, [Italics mine]
So trust ye not in Carcasons
In Genovese, nor in Gascon."

Thus, after all the discoverable facts of the case have been sifted, the first part of "Near Perigord" ends on the basic question: What was Bertran's motive in writing the poem?

In Part II, Pound imaginatively tries to recreate the details and the mood of the composition of the "Dompna soissenbuda." First we get the mental and physical struggle of the composition as Bertran searches for the rhyme words (*al* and *ochaisos*).[6]

The song finished, the jongleur ("magnet") sets forth to visit the castles of the various ladies mentioned in the poem. The plan of spying out the land goes well enough until, at the castle of Maria of Ventadour (sister of Maent), Sir Arrimon, who is friendly to Richard, sees through the love phrases and discovers the interesting arrangement of the castles, scents a plot, and sends a warnng off to Richard in time for him to nip the plot by besieging Hautefort. On just such a chance hinged the success of the plan. One pair of attentive and sensitive ears, used to the deceptive intricacies of the *trobar clus*,[7] could perhaps catch the hidden meaning.

Now Pound sharply changes the focus of his imaginative attention. Still unsatisfied that he has arrived at the truth, he creates a dramatic scene in which Richard and Arnaut Daniel, in a pause before the battle for the castle at Châlus (in Limousin where Richard was killed the next day), discuss the tantalizing Bertran and try to resolve the question for themselves. The scene is evoked in a perfect accumulation of detail, even to the lions[8] on the standard of Richard. There they sit, discussing poetry. Arnaut Daniel, whom Dante (*Purgatorio,* XXVI, 117) called *il miglior fabbro* (the "better" craftsman), discusses the *trobar clus* with fellow-troubador Richard. This brings them naturally to a discussion

[6] Instead of having rhyme within each stanza, as an English-speaking reader might expect, Bertran in this poem rhymes the same lines in each stanza. *Al* is the rhyme ending for the first line of each stanza; *ochaisos* is the rhyme for the third line of each stanza.

[7] There were two schools of poetry at the time: *trobar clus* was poetry of hidden and obscure meanings; *trobar leu* was straightforward and simple.

[8] In early heraldry only the lion *rampant* was actually called a lion; a lion *passant* was called a leopard.

of the "Dompna soissenbuda," which Daniel sings, and, of course, they too try to unravel the mystery of Bertran. Richard's question is successfully parried by a reminder of Bertran's suit of his own sister Helen. Was that love or a political suit?

And so Part II ends with the question still unanswered. Richard dies the next day; Daniel himself dies *not* in "sacred odour,"[9] and Bertran de Born is ignored until Dante (*Inferno*, XXVIII) places him in Hell.

The epigraph for Part III subtly changes the antecedents of Dante's pronouns: "and they were two in one, and one in two." Dante was speaking of the severed parts of Bertran de Born as he walked in Hell. Pound uses the quotation to give the solution to the question. "They" in the epigraph clearly means Bertran and Lady Maent as well as the divided Bertran. Did he love her? Yes. Did he use the poem as a battle strategem? Yes, to that question too. Bertran was in love with two ladies—Lady Maent and Lady Battle. Maent loved him and at the same time hated his scheming mind. He loved her but could not give up his other love, War, and the poem ends on a note of frustration that naturally resulted when he was forcibly shut out of her life.

University of Buffalo

[9] See Pound's essay "Arnaut Daniel," *Make It New*, p. 43: "Nor is it known if Benvenuto da Imola speaks for certain when he says En Arnaut went in his age to a monastery . . ." The phrase "in sacred odour" is used by the Church in its lives of the saints to describe the death of a holy man: viz., "In the odor of sanctity so and so passed to the arms of the Lord, etc."

NEAR PERIGORD *

A Perigord pres del muralh
Tan que i puosch' om gitar ab malh.

You'd have men's hearts up from the dust
And tell their secrets, Messire Cino,
Right enough? Then read between the lines
of Uc St. Circ,
Solve me the riddle, for you know the tale.

Bertrans, En Bertrans, left a fine canzone;
"Maent, I love you, you have turned me out.
The voice at Montfort, Lady Agnes' hair,
Bel Miral's stature, the viscountess' throat,
Set all together, are not worthy of you. . . ."
And all the while you sing out that canzone,
Think you that Maent lived at Montaignac,
One at Chalais, another at Malemort
Hard over Brive—for every lady a castle,
Each place strong.

Oh, *is* it easy enough?
Tairiran held hall in Montagnac,
His brother-in-law was all there was of power
In Perigord, and this good union
Gobbled all the land, and held it later for some
hundred years.
And our En Bertrans was in Altafort,
Hub of the wheel, the stirrer-up of strife,
As caught by Dante in the last wallow of hell—
The headless trunk "that made its head a lamp,"
For separation wrought out separation,
And he who set the strife between brother and
brother
And had his way with the old English king,
Viced in such torture for the "counterpass."
How would you live, with neighbours set about you—
Poictiers and Brive, untaken Rochecouart,
Spread like the finger-tips of one frail hand;
And you on that great mountain of a palm—
Not a neat ledge, not Foix between its streams,
But one huge back half-covered up with pine,
Worked for and snatched from the string-purse of
Born—
The four round towers, four brothers—mostly
fools:
What could he do but play the desperate chess,
And stir old grudges?
"Pawn your castles, lords!
Let the Jews pay."
And the great scene—

---

* Copyright 1926, 1952 by Ezra Pound, and reprinted by permission of the publisher, New Directions.

(That, maybe, never happened!)
Beaten at last,
Before the hard old king:
"Your son, ah, since he died
"My wit and worth are cobwebs brushed aside
"In the full flare of grief. Do what you will."

Take the whole man, and ravel out the story.
He loved this lady in castle Montaignac?
The castle flanked him—he had need of it.
You read to-day, how long the overlords of Perigord,
The Talleyrands, have held the place; it was no transient fiction.
And Maent failed him? Or saw through the scheme?

And all his net-like thought of new alliance?
Chalais is high, a-level with the poplars.
Its lowest stones just meet the valley tips
Where the low Dronne is filled with water-lilies.
And Rochecouart can match it, stronger yet,
The very spur's end, built on sheerest cliff,
And Malemort keeps its close hold on Brive,
While Born, his own close purse, his rabbit warren,
His subterranean chamber with a dozen doors,
A-bristle with antennae to feel roads,
To sniff the traffic into Perigord.
And that hard phalanx, that unbroken line,
The ten good miles from there to Maent's castle,
All of his flank—how could he do without her?
And all the road to Cahors, to Toulouse?
What would he do without her?

"Papiol,
Go forthright singing—Anhes, Cembelins.
There is a throat; ah, there are two white hands;
There is a trellis full of early roses,
And all my heart is bound about with love.
Where am I come with compound flatteries—
What doors are open to fine compliment?"
And every one half jealous of Maent?
He wrote the catch to pit their jealousies
Against her; give her pride in them?

Take his own speech, make what you will of it—
And still the knot, the first knot, of Maent?

Is it a love poem? Did he sing of war?
Is it an intrigue to run subtly out,
Born of a jongleur's tongue, freely to pass
Up and about and in and out the land,
Mark him a craftsman and a strategist?
(St. Leider had done as much as Polhonac,
Singing a different stave, as closely hidden.)

Oh, there is precedent, legal tradition,
To sing one thing when your song means another,
"*Et albirar ab lor bordon*—"
Foix' count knew that. What is Sir Bertrans'
singing?
Maent, Maent, and yet again Maent,
Or war and broken heaumes and politics?

II

End fact. Try fiction. Let us say we see
En Bertrans, a tower-room at Hautefort,
Sunset, the ribbon-like road lies, in red cross-light,
Southward toward Montaignac, and he bends at a
table
Scribbling, swearing between his teeth; by his left hand
Lie little strips of parchment covered over,
Scratched and erased with *al* and *ochaisos*.
Testing his list of rhymes, a lean man? Bilious?
With a red straggling beard?
And the green cat's-eye lifts toward Montaignac.

Or take his "magnet" singer setting out,
Dodging his way past Aubeterre, singing at Chalais
In the vaulted hall,
Or, by a lichened tree at Rochecouart
Aimlessly watching a hawk above the valleys,
Waiting his turn in the mid-summer evening,
Thinking of Aelis, whom he loved heart and
soul . . .
To find her half alone, Montfort away,
And a brown, placid, hated woman visiting her,
Spoiling his visit, with a year before the next one.
Little enough?
Or carry him forward. "Go through all the courts,
My Magnet," Bertrans had said.

We came to Ventadour
In the mid love court, he sings out the canzon,
No one hears save Arrimon Luc D'Esparo—
No one hears aught save the gracious sound of compli-
ments.
Sir Arrimon counts on his fingers, Montfort,
Rochecouart, Chalais, the rest, the tactic,
Malemort, guesses beneath, sends word to Cœur-de-
Lion:
The compact, de Born smoked out, trees felled
About his castle, cattle driven out!
Or no one sees it, and En Bertrans prospered?

And ten years after, or twenty, as you will,
Arnaut and Richard lodge beneath Chalus:
The dull round towers encroaching on the field,
The tents tight drawn, horses at tether
Further and out of reach, the purple night,

The crackling of small fires, the bannerets,
The lazy leopards on the largest banner,
Stray gleams on hanging mail, an armourer's torch-
flare
Melting on steel.

And in the quietest space
They probe old scandals, say de Born is dead;
And we've the gossip (skipped six hundred years).
Richard shall die to-morrow—leave him there
Talking of *trobar clus* with Daniel.
And the "best craftsman" sings out his friend's
song,
Envies its vigour . . . and deplores the technique,
Dispraises his own skill?—That's as you will.
And they discuss the dead man,
Plantagenet puts the riddle: "Did he love her?"
And Arnaut parries: "Did he love your sister?
True, he has praised her, but in some opinion
He wrote that praise only to show he had
The favour of your party; had been well received."

"You knew the man."
"*You* knew the man."
"I am an artist, you have tried both métiers."
"You were born near him."
"Do we know our friends?"
"Say that he saw the castles, say that he loved
Maent!"
"Say that he loved her, does it solve the riddle?"
End the discussion, Richard goes out next day
And gets a quarrel-bolt shot through his vizard,
Pardons the bowman, dies,

Ends our discussion. Arnaut ends
"In sacred odour"—(that's apocryphal!)
And we can leave the talk till Dante writes:
Surely I say, and still before my eyes
Goes on that headless trunk, that bears for light
Its own head swinging, gripped by the dead hair,
And like a swinging lamp that says, "Ah me!
I severed men, my head and heart
Ye see here severed, my life's counterpart."

Or take En Bertrans?

III

Ed eran due in uno, ed uno in due;
Inferno, XXVIII, 125

Bewildering spring, and by the Auvezere
Poppies and day's eyes in the green émail
Rose over us; and we knew all that stream,
And our two horses had traced out the valleys;
Knew the low flooded lands squared out with
poplars,

In the young days when the deep sky befriended.
And great wings beat above us in the twilight,
And the great wheels in heaven
Bore us together ... surging ... and apart ...
Believing we should meet with lips and hands,

High, high and sure ... and then the counter-thrust:
'Why do you love me? Will you always love me?
But I am like the grass, I can not love you.'
Or, 'Love, and I love and love you,
And hate your mind, not *you*, your soul, your hands.'

So to this last estrangement, Tairiran!

There shut up in his castle, Tairiran's,
She who had nor ears nor tongue save in her hands,
Gone—ah, gone—untouched, unreachable!
She who could never live save through one person,
And all the rest of her a shifting change,
A broken bundle of mirrors ... !

UNAMUNO AND TENNYSON

ANNA KRAUSE

THE publication during the last fifteen years of important segments of Miguel de Unamuno's private correspondence[1] has opened the way for the study of that *congenialidad* with the English poets of the nineteenth century of which there are unquestionable traces in his writings.

Antonio Sánchez Barbudo's remark[2] that the English poets, together with a number of other European writers, find an echo in Unamuno's works after 1900 invites clarification. Nemesio González Caminero claims that Unamuno's enthusiasm and familiarity with English poets, philosophers, and churchmen came after he abandoned orthodox thought and attributes his marked interest in these writers to "una oculta y maravillosa afinidad entre su franqueza y primitivismo vascongados y el realismo práctico, aun en literatura, de los ingleses."[3] Carlos Clavería has made a basic contribution to the subject in several chapters of his *Temas de Unamuno* (1953). He points out convincingly that Unamuno's sympathetic reading of *Sartor Resartus* influenced the conception of the first of his "nivolas," *Amor y pedagogía*, and that some years later he drew on Byron's *Cain* for his *Abel Sánchez*. Clavería opens up another important aspect of the question when he suggests that "posiblemente la lectura de poetas ingleses tuvo gran parte en la estructuración y estilo de sus poemas."[4] It has been my conviction for some time that arresting points of contact are to be noted between the author of *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida* and the Victorian poet whom T. S. Eliot has called "the saddest of all English poets, among the Great in Limbo, the most instinctive rebel against the society in which he was the most perfect conformist," Lord Tennyson.[5] In the following pages I shall

[1] I refer to *Epistolario a Clarín* (Madrid, 1941); "Cartas inéditas de Miguel de Unamuno y de Pedro Jiménez Ilundain," *Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires*, 4th ser., III (1948); *Unamuno y Maragall: Epistolario* (Barcelona, 1951); Bernardo G. de Candamo, "Unamuno en sus cartas," *Ensayos*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1951)—the letter fragments are not dated but are said to cover the years 1900-05. All citations from Unamuno's *Ensayos* in the following paper are from this edition, referred to as *E*. Manuel García Blanco includes passages from Unamuno's correspondence not found in the foregoing in *Don Miguel de Unamuno y sus poesías* (Salamanca, 1954).

[2] "La formación del pensamiento de Unamuno. Une experiencia decisiva: la crisis de 1897," *HR*, XVIII (1950), 233.

[3] N. González Caminero, *Unamuno* (Santander, 1948), p. 85.

[4] C. Clavería, *Temas de Unamuno* (Madrid, 1953), pp. 29 f.

[5] "*In Memoriam*," *Essays Ancient and Modern*, 6th ed. (New York, n.d.), pp. 202 f.

seek to justify this conviction, following the thread of relationship as it becomes apparent in Unamuno's early writings.

In a highly subjective passage of "José Asunción Silva" Unamuno implies that English poetry of the nineteenth century elevates and strengthens the spirit in moods of sadness or depression. Vigorously rejecting the supposition that Silva's suicide was induced by a reading of Schopenhauer, he adds: "... porque estoy convencido de que no son los escritores pesimistas y desesperanzados los que entristecen y amargan las almas como la de Silva, sino que más bien son las almas desesperanzadas y tristes las que buscan alimento en tales escritores."[6] He finds the conclusive motive for suicide in the poet's own words:

¿Loco? ... ¿y por qué no? Así murió Baudelaire, el más grande para los verdaderos letrados de los poetas de los últimos cincuenta años ... ¿Por qué no has de morir así, podre degenerado, que abusaste de todo, que soñaste con dominar el arte, con poseer la ciencia y con agotar todas las copas en que brinda la vida las embriagueces supremas? [II, 1058].

Baudelaire the greatest poet of the last half century? asks Unamuno with indignation. And what of the English, Italian, Scandinavian poets of the period? Silva may have known Browning, Walt Whitman, Carducci only by name if indeed that. "Y fué lástima," he concludes,

porque es seguro que de haberlos conocido, de haberse familiarizado algo con la maravillosa poesía lírica inglesa del pasado siglo—tan superior en conjunto a la lírica francesa, en el fondo lógica, sensual y fría—habria encontrado otros tonos. ¿Qué no le hubieran dicho a Silva Cowper, Burns, Wordsworth, Shelley, Lord Byron—a éste lo conocía—Tennyson, Swinburne, Longfellow, Browning, Isabel Barrett Browning, Christina Rossetti, Thomson, ... Keats, y en general, todo el espléndido coro lírico de la poesía inglesa del siglo XIX?

He then adds the significant words: "Es muy fácil que le hubieran levantado el ánimo tanto como Baudelaire se lo deprimió y abatió. ¡Pobre Silva!" (II, 1059).[7]

The year of Silva's death, 1896, was precisely the year in which Unamuno was contemplating with high hopes the success of his first major work, *Paz en la guerra*, and finding, if our supposition is correct, a stimulating source of inspiration for his poetic efforts in these same English poets whom he was later to acclaim with such enthusiasm. In various passages of this autobiographical novel, conceived in the mid-1880s but written in great part during the summer of 1896, he dwells with special insistence on the problems of his spiritual life (presented through his character Pachico), the early period of "misticismo infantil

[6] *E*, II, 1056.

[7] In the first of Unamuno's articles on Silva, a prologue written in 1908 for the Maucci edition of the writer's poems, Silva is spoken of as a "poeta metafísico," the product of a religious upbringing and provincial environment similar to Unamuno's own. This dictum is reversed in the second article published in *La Nación*, obviously to placate the "estetas impenitentes que se horroricen de verme ayuntar esos dos términos" (*E*, II, 1055).

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED LIBRARY AUG 19 1956 MANHATTAN KANSAS

y de voracidad intelectual," the tendency to rationalize his faith under the influence of his readings of Kant and Krause, and the day when, as a student in Madrid, he abandoned his practice of attending mass. At this time a new world of fantasy opened up before him, the world of English literature—Shakespeare, Ossian. He became one of those who "sobre la base de la fe antigua, dormida y no muerta, han cobrado otra nueva, con vagos anhelos a una fe inconciente que uniera a las dos."[8]

Mystic experiences, Unamuno relates, came to him frequently when out of doors. Pachico was in the habit of pausing in his strolls along the Cantabrian coast on a promontory overlooking the wide expanse of sky and water. He would yield to a sense of inner communion with life "in all of its purity," ceasing to be conscious of time. As the wind agitated the waves and swept the clouds across the sky, it was as though he had a vision of the Omnipotent, speaking the word to bring forth new worlds from the submissive waters. His "intellectual crisis" of the Madrid years now appeared as unreal. Submerged in a feeling of inner peace, Pachico was able to think "con su ser todo, no sólo con su inteligencia, sintiendo la honda vida de la fe veradera, de la fe en la fe misma, penetrado de la solemne seriedad de la vida, ansioso de verdad y no de razón" (p. 280).

A similar experience is described in the final pages of the work, the pages which the positivist Jiménez Ilundain disliked because of their *nebulosidad*,[9] Unamuno coming to their defense (in a letter of May 24, 1899) with the retort: "¿Qué quiere usted que le diga, amigo Jiménez? ¡Esas mis nebulosidades es lo que más amo!" In this purple passage we find Pachico on a mountain top, "the altar of God." He again feels that awareness of harmony at the heart of his being and of the cosmic forces about him. Immersed in an overwhelming sense of peace, his soul singing the song of creation as it unfolds in harmonious space and melodic time, he listens to the voice of wisdom, urging conformity with the upward march. The God-power gives of Itself freely and without stint to those who give themselves to It wholly and unreservedly. He who can call good all that transpires finds that what he desires does occur. Exalted by this insight, Pachico descends to the tumult of life with a new sense of freedom. He can take up with conviction the struggle ("la guerra, ley de la vida"), and find peace ("la paz, reflejo del concierto del mundo").[10] In March 1900 Unamuno wrote to Clarín of these pages:

> . . al morir quisiera, ya que tengo alguna ambición, que dijesen de mí: ¡fué todo un poeta! Doy lo más instructivo y erudito que haya escrito o pueda escribir por algunas páginas de mi *Paz en la guerra*, por su final sobre todo. Allí eché mi alma . . . puse mi espíritu todo.

[8] *Paz en la guerra*, 2nd ed. (Madrid, 1923), pp. 59-63.

[9] Eche a un lado ese panteísmo de nuevo cuño que se desprende de las tres últimas páginas de *Paz en la guerra*," counseled his friend. "Hay una atmósfera que denota en Vd. una alma profundamente religiosa en su irreligiosidad" ("Cartas inéditas . . . ," pp. 57 f.).

[10] *E*, I, 115.

Before inquiring into the motives that prompted this frank avowal, it is well to recall that the optimistic note on which Unamuno brought to a close his first novel, the fruit of ten or twelve years of "meditations," was soon dispelled. In March 1897 he suffered the emotional crisis discussed in Sánchez Barbudo's article, which, for a time at least, assumed the character of a religious conversion. In all likelihood an important contributory cause was the rift with Clarín that came to a head at this time, interrupting the correspondence which had begun on Unamuno's initiative in 1895. A copy of the "autobiography" was sent to Clarín in December 1896, but the review to which Unamuno was looking forward so eagerly—Clarín had spoken of *En torno al casticismo* as "fuerte, nuevo, original"—was not forthcoming. It was precisely in January 1897 that Clarín bestowed his accolade on Martínez Ruiz, ten years Unamuno's junior, for his satire on the dramatic critic published in *La Saeta* of Barcelona, thus bypassing the author of *Paz en la guerra*, or so it must have seemed. That Clarín's action did not pass unnoticed is apparent from a remark made by Unamuno in a letter of May 9, 1900, written after a reconciliation had been made, implying that Clarín had been "extra-indulgente con nuestro amigo Martínez Ruiz." Disappointed in his literary ambitions at the time of a distressing family tragedy, alluded to in this same letter, Unamuno's final recourse, it appears, was a quickening of his religious aspiration, a strengthening of the "cristianismo íntimo, orgánico, hecho masa y fuente de actos reflejos," as he wrote of his personal faith in a letter to Clarín in 1895. Coleridge, Wordsworth, Browning had expressed intimate religious experience of a similar nature in lyric poetry which Unamuno described to Rubén Darío as "esa poesía recogida y solemne que se confunde casi con la metafísica íntima de los fondes inefables del espíritu, henchida en seriedad, penetrada de la melodía infinita."[11] It was his belief, moreover, expressed in *Recuerdos*,[12] that mystic experience "más o menos efímera" was indispensable for a true understanding of "la más pura poesía humana," which embraced, obviously, English poetry of the nineteenth century.

A careful reading of the final pages of *Paz en la guerra*, to pick up our earlier discussion, strengthens one's conviction that this part of the novel was written under poetic inspiration, presumably that of the English poets, especially Wordsworth. Indeed Unamuno's friend Vicente Colorado once asked him why he had not written the closing lines of *Paz en la guerra* in the form of verse. "Y acaso tenía razón. En prosa ritmoide va a dar a las veces," adds the author of *Andanzas y visiones*.[13] There is evidence that Unamuno read and translated Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Browning in the 1880s, and also, if our impression is justified, Tennyson. He learned to read English at twenty-six, finding in trans-

[11] A. Ghiraldo, *El archivo de Rubén Darío* (Buenos Aires), p. 34.
[12] Page 157.
[13] Madrid, 1922, p. 257. Cf. "Cartas inéditas," p. 67; *Teresa* (Madrid, n.d.) p. 29.

lation, as he wrote to his friend Juan Maragall, a potent means of enriching the spiritual life. "Porque cada amigo que cobro—y hago amigos míos a quienes traduzco—me sirve más aun que por lo que de sí da por lo que de mí mismo me descubre."[14] A translation from Coleridge, "Reflexiones al tener que dejar un lugar de retiro," was included in the collection of original poems entitled *Veintisiete poesías* that Luis Ruiz Contreras offered to publish in 1899, although they did not appear until 1907, in expanded form, as *Poesías*. Unamuno described the poetry of the collection as "más bien meditativo que otra cosa, al modo de los musings ingleses, con algo de salmo a las veces, y casi nada de erótico."[15] One of the poems of *Veintisiete poesías*, "La flor tronchada," given separate publication in *Revista Nueva* in 1899, picks up the theme "la paz como raíz y culminación de la guerra," which appeared first in *De mística y humanismo* and later as "the melodic theme" of his novel. The evolution of this motif, paralleling as it does the course of Unamuno's religious thought, and culminating in "la religión de la guerra," constitutes a study in itself.[16] However, these early versions are of interest, for they indicate that before the close of the century Unamuno was giving poetic expression to the concept of organic evolution.

The 1890s were precisely the years in which Unamuno was deeply interested in the scientific advances of the century. After learning to read English he had translated Spencer and Carlyle, experiencing what Pedro Laín Entralgo has called "un fugaz optimismo cientificista . . . cuando era algo así como spenceriano."[17] Darwin's *Origin of Species* was one of the books in his library that he had most copiously annotated. Indeed, the influence on Unamuno's writings of this scientist, whom he spoke of as "nada dogmático y nada sectario, un verdadero científico" is "clarísima," in the opinion of Carlos Blanco Aguinaga.[18] In *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida* we find Unamuno expressing admiration for the doctrine of evolution as propounded by Darwin, characterizing it as "sana, cautelosamente empírica y racional."[19] His correspondence with Candamo contains numerous passages in which he expresses the hope that the conflict between science and religion will produce beneficient results, that the day will come when scientific principles such as the conservation of energy, the unity of all physical force, and the evolution of living species will be a religious dogma, a source of consolation, and a guide to conduct for man. He also expresses satisfaction at having

[14] *Unamuno y Maragall*, p. 36.

[15] *E*, II, 65.

[16] An interesting analysis of the concepts *paz* and *guerra* might be made taking as point of departure W. T. Stace's discussion of the negative and the positive divine in *Time and Eternity. An Essay in the Philosophy of Religion* (Princeton, 1952). See p. 59.

[17] P. Laín Entralgo, *La generación del noventa y ocho*, ed. Austral, p. 65.

[18] *Unamuno, teórico del lenguaje* (Mexico City, 1954), p. 49.

[19] *E*, II, 862.

studied metaphysics, psychology, and "todo género de ciencias. Paisaje hay al final de mi *Paz en la guerra* que me fué sugerido por la lectura de un tratado de geología, y creo, sin embargo, que no tiene el menor rastro de pedantería científica."[20]

Now the English poet of the nineteenth century who accepted most fully advances in the field of science, above all the idea of evolution, was Alfred Tennyson. The keynote of his belief was acceptance of the dynamic principle of change, of becoming, of upward striving.

> Yet I doubt not thro' the ages one increasing purpose runs...
> Forward, forward, let us range,
> Let the great world spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change...

was the message of "Locksley Hall." Browning as well as Tennyson, as Arthur Lovejoy points out in *The Great Chain of Being*, identified the chief value of existence with process and struggle in time; both felt an antipathy toward satisfaction and finality. Evolution for the author of *In Memoriam* was, in its final analysis, a spiritual unfolding:

> ...Arise and fly
> The reeling Faun, the sensual feast;
> Move upward, working out the beast,
> And let the ape and tiger die.
> (cxviii, 25-28)

Having reached an optimum of physical growth, man was now entering upon what might be called the fifth of the Giant Ages, in which as a spiritual entity he could freely exercise the prerogatives of choice and initiative, collaborating actively with the Father God of whom the poet affirmed, in "The Higher Pantheism,"

> Speak to Him thou for he hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet
> Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

Is there evidence that Unamuno knew *In Memoriam*, in which Tennyson's concept of spiritual evolution is fully set forth? In seeking to answer this question let us recall briefly the unfolding of Unamuno's all-absorbing and adolescent passion for poetry, merged with his interest in philosophy (Kant, Hegel, Balmes) and to a certain extent in science (Newton). In *Recuerdos de niñez y mocedad*, written in the belief that one's early years "tiñen con la luz de sus olvidados recuerdos toda nuestra vida, recuerdos que aun olvidados siguen vivificándose desde los soterraños de nuestro espíritu...,"[21] he tells how, perched in the branches of a pear tree in the family orchard, he would recite verses by José Zorrilla from his *Rhetoric*, intoxicated by their rhythmic harmony. He recalls his habit of taking walks through the countryside on a physician's order ("Entró Pachico en la pubertad enclenque y canijo"),[22] and also the last years of the *bachillerato* when he frequented a public

[20] *E*, II, 38.
[21] Madrid, 1908, p. 175.
[22] *Paz en la guerra*, p. 59.

library and, reading the lore of his people, became interested in, among other authors, Vicente Arana, whose translation of Tennyson's *Enoch Arden* impressed him deeply. "Así es que cuando más tarde, hace tres o cuatro años, le leí de nuevo, en inglés, a la impresión directa de tan hermoso poema, se unió como eco harmonioso el recuerdo de aquella otra lectura sorbida en la pubertad de mi espíritu," he writes in *Recuerdos* (p. 212). Did this early acquaintance with Tennyson include *In Memoriam*? An obscure passage in *Teresa*, one of Unamuno's most enigmatic works, implies that he may have known the poem. It is generally conceded, as Unamuno insinuates in a letter of 1923 to Alfonso Reyes,[23] that this collection of *rimas* or love poems in the manner of Bécquer was written shortly before its publication in 1924. However, commenting on a passage in the prologue or "Presentación," in which the Spanish poet indicates that reading these poems is like coming upon "uno de mis yos ex-futuros, con uno de los míos que dejé al borde del sendero al pasar de los veinticinco," García Blanco observes that the "credo poético" displayed in this lyric sequence "está más cerca de 1889, en que el autor contaba esos veinticinco años, que del que instauró con su libro de *Poesías*, diez años más tarde."[24] Recalling Unamuno's reticence in disclosing certain intimate *vivencias*, his propensity for mystifying readers and critics alike, and his disdain for the "cuervos investigadores" of his verses,[25] it may well be that he sought to conceal from his contemporaries the true inspiration and date of composition of the *rimas*. If they were written in the 1880s, as appears likely, the framework or story of Rafael and Teresa, together with the "Presentación" and "Notas," could have been added later. Imbedded in the "Notas" (p. 51) is the passage: "Cuando supe la muerte de mi Rafael de Teresa pensé haber escrito un canto a ella y a él, *In memoriam*, e incluirlo como cierre de este libro." The theme of *Teresa* is the theme of *mors-amor*, for which Unamuno had a special predilection. Tennyson's lyric sequence on love, death, and immortality may have contributed to his desire to compose a work on this theme. There is no indication in *Teresa*, however, of the religious philosophy that he was later to admire in Tennyson's poetry.

A further link in Unamuno's early acquaintance with Tennyson is the Salmo II, one of the poems included in *Veintisiete poesías*. We have already referred to "La flor tronchada" of this collection, a "simple meditation," as he calls it in a letter to Ruiz Contreras in which he sets forth his poetic credo at the turn of the century. Under the symbolism

[23] *Don Miguel de Unamuno y sus poesías*, p. 266.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 267. In a letter to Ruiz Contreras of May 14, 1899 Unamuno, speaking of the poems he is submitting for publication, affirms that this is the fourth time in the last fourteen or fifteen years that he has written verse (García Blanco, p. 15). Were the *rimas* of *Teresa* written on one of these occasions?

[25] See *Teresa*, p. 199.

of the delicate wild flower plowed under by the husbandman—a motif associated in the poet's mind, as we note in *La tradición eterna*, with Robert Burns—Unamuno presents struggle as the basic law of existence, a law sanctified by the supreme Harvester who creates by destroying and destroys by creating. The words in which he invokes Deity, "Padre de Amor, Sol de las almas," have the ring of Tennyson's "Strong Son of God, immortal Love . . ." García Blanco discusses briefly Salmos I and III, which he dates prior to the summer of 1906, but curiously enough he omits all reference to Salmo II. Ideas are expressed in the poem which are found also in *Ideocracia*, which leads to the supposition that it was composed around 1900. In the opening lyric of *In Memoriam* Tennyson enunciates the idea that the religious experience is essentially of the heart and also that the existence of God cannot be proved by "knowledge." In view of the conflict between faith or intuition (the heart) and reason (conceptual thinking), we can only cling to our faith, "Believing where we cannot prove," trusting, in moments of doubt, when the voice, "Believe no more," is heard echoing from the godless deep, that the illuminated insight comes from above and will grow like a beam in darkness.

Unamuno develops a similar line of thought in his own forceful Salmo II. The faith that does not question is arrogant, godless, for life is doubt and faith without doubt is death.

> Lejos de mí, Señor, el pensamiento
> de enterrarte en la idea,
> la impiedad de querer con raciocinios
> demostrar tu existencia . . .

God is unknowable (conceptually), as Tennyson had declared in lyric cxxiii of *In Memoriam*.

> Yo te siento, Señor, no te conozco,
> tu Espíritu me envuelve,
> si conozco contigo,
> si eres la lux de mi conocimiento
> ¿cómo he de conocerte, Inconocible?

The closing lines formulate a prayer based on Mark 9:24,[26] a favorite Biblical paradox of our poet:

> Creo, Señor, en ti, sin conocerte . . .
> creo, confío en Ti, Señor; ayuda
> mi desconfianza.

In *Del sentimiento*, conceived probably during these same transitional years, Unamuno presents his most ambitious analysis of this theme, which has been called by Oromí "la fe dubitativa." Unamuno shared his enthusiasm for this new creative project with his friend Candamo in a letter which reads as follows:

[26] See *Del sentimiento* (*E*, II, 837) for a clarification of this theme.

Por mi parte, cada día siento más respeto al mundo del misterio y cada día se hace en mí más luz respecto al mundo del misterio y cada día se hace en mí más luz respecto a la fecunda lucha entre la razón y la fe, la ciencia y la religión... La filosofía es una matemática, la religión una intuición. Sobre esto y desarrollando este punto de vista proyecto escribir un libro titulado, o bien *Ciencia y Religión*, o bien *Razón y fe*. En ella asentaré la contradicción íntima e irreductible como principio fecundo de vida espiritual. No quiero buscar mi paz interior en armonías, concordancias y compromisos que llevan a la estabilidad inerte, no quiero que firmen paz mi corazón y mi cabeza, sino que luchen entre sí, lealmente, pero con vigor. Soy y quiero seguir siendo un espíritu antinómico, dualista...

Mi vida toda se mueve por un principio de íntima contradicción. Me atrae la lucha y siento ansias de quietud y paz; estudio de ciencias y caigo en poeta... [*E*, II, 51 f.].[27]

In short, the *agonista* in Unamuno demanded conflict, struggle, intellectual challenge and, although there were moments and periods in which, as a lover of Nature, he felt at one with the "gentle and noble Wordsworth,"[28] he was acutely conscious, as was Tennyson, of the strife underlying the upward movement of organic life, and he would undoubtedly have endorsed the faith that evoked God as Love,

> And love Creation's final law—
> Tho' Nature, red in tooth and claw
> With ravine, shriek'd against his creed.
> (*In Memoriam*, lvi, 14-16)

Kinship with Tennyson as poet and religious prophet comes to a head in *Del sentimiento* or *Tratado del amor de Dios*, as Unamuno speaks of this work in his letters to Maragall (1900-11). Philosophical concepts common to both poets are analyzed here—the ultimate nature of reality, the problem of knowledge with its distinction between the knowing mind and the believing soul (knowledge being of things we "see," sense perception, rational proof), faith transcending the veil of sense and reason to intuit a personal God. In *Del sentimiento* the Spaniard mentions Tennyson's philosophic lyrics which appear to have been his favorites: "The Two Voices," with its discussion of the worth of human life; "The Higher Pantheism," treating the ultimate nature of reality; "De Pro-

[27] Blanco Aguinaga writes: "Cierto que Unamuno, para tragedia y gloria suya, es un gran racionalista y que por serlo no puede seguir confiadamente los dictados de su corazón: de aquí la lucha" (p. 82).

[28] In his essay of July 1902 Unamuno recalled the "serena tranquilidad de los lakistas, y sobretodo de aquel dulcísimo y nobilísimo Wordsworth, que lejos de tráfago ciudadano, vivío en santa comunión con la naturaleza, gozando de 'elegantes goces, que son puros como lo es la naturaleza, demasiado puros para ser refinados'" (*E*, I, 371). In 1904 he wrote: "Sénancour, con Wordsworth, son para mí, como para Mateo Arnold eran, de los espíritus más hondos que han existido. No se puede leerlos sino en el recogimiento de una celda, en el campo, y no cabe hablar de ellos en la mesa de un café ni de sobremesa" (*E*, II, 62). Writing for the Argentines, he puts Tennyson in a class with Byron as a cosmopolitan poet who is translated and imitated, while Wordsworth, "de los de más anglicanidad," he says, is scarcely cited outside of England and America and, one should add, is disliked by the French who know English literature (*E*, II, 1089).

fundis," on the mystery of personality; "The Ancient Sage," presenting materialistic and agnostic views of God and immortality; "Locksley Hall," which enunciates man's freedom of moral choice, the "heaven-descended Will." Tennyson worked on *In Memoriam* over a span of seventeen years. Similarly, *Del sentimiento* took shape slowly during some twelve years or more. During this time Unamuno continued to read and ponder Tennyson, and referred to his poetry from time to time in the essays written during the first decade of the new century. Let us indicate briefly the most important of these references.

In *Adentro* Unamuno touches on evolution. "Hasta carnalmente no provenimos de un solo ascendiente, sino de legión vamos; somos un nudo en la trama de las generaciones."[29] Two years later, referring to the same concept, he quotes a line from "De Profundis," "From death to death through life and life," adding: "Mas no conviene entristecernos." Tennyson's line, out of context, must have mystified his Spanish readers. The initiated would be aware, however, that in this deeply religious poem composed on the birth of his eldest son, the English poet expressed one of the main tenets of his moral idealism, to which we have already referred, the belief that, by exercising freely one's power of selection and initiative, the individual will can be brought into harmony with the divine Will, and man can collaborate with the Nameless One in forging his spiritual destiny.

> Live thou! and of the grain and husk,
> the grape
> And ivyberry, choose; and still depart
> From death to death thro' life and life,
> and find
> Nearer and ever nearer Him, who wrought
> Not Matter, nor the finite-infinite,
> But this main-miracle, that thou art thou,
> With power on thine own act and on the world.

In the same month in which Unamuno was apparently accepting the optimistic view of evolution proclaimed by Tennyson, evolution as a gradual "working out of the beast," he was exploring and clarifying the idea of personality in his essay, *Individualismo español*. Personality, he concludes "se refiere principalmente a nuestros límites, o mejor no límites, hacia adentro, presenta nuestra infinitud."[30] In *Del sentimiento* he reiterates this idea: ". . . mi personalidad [the spiritual man?] es mi comprensión, lo que comprendo y encierro en mí—y que es de una cierta manera todo el Universo, y mi individualidad [the flesh?] es mi extensión; lo uno, lo infinito mío, y lo otro, mi infinito."[31] Proceeding from the principle of finite personality, "this main miracle that thou

[29] *E*, II, 193.
[30] *E*, II, 441.
[31] *E*, II, 883.

art thou," Tennyson postulated his concept of Infinite Being, Self-Conscious Spirit. Through love the consciousness of self is quickened, he thought. This concept, *Amo, ergo sum*, is fundamental to the analysis of human personality developed by Unamuno in *Niebla*. In *Del sentimiento* he had written shortly before: "El Dios de la fe es personal, es persona, porque incluye tres personas, puesto que la personalidad no se siente aislada. Una persona aislada deja de serlo. ¿A quién, en efecto, amaría? Y si no ama, no es persona."[32] In another passage of the same work he affirms that love causes us to personalize the Whole of which we are a part, that the God with whom we establish our oneness by feeling, the living God, is "el Universo mismo personalizado," the Consciousness of the Universe—statements which of course admit of much amplification.

Finally, in *Sobre la europeización* (1906), in which Unamuno turned against European rationalism to affirm "el método de la pasión," he cites a passage in "The Ancient Sage" in support of his contention that rational proof is not conclusive when the question is one of ultimate reality. "No fué español, aunque por ello merecía haberlo sido, sino inglés, el que escribió estos perdurables versos,"[33] he writes, quoting the following "preñados versos":

> For nothing worth proving can
> be proven
> Nor yet disproven: wherefore
> thou be wise,
> Cleave ever to the sunnier
> side of doubt,
> And cling to Faith beyond the
> forms of faith!

—which he then translates into Spanish.

As we turn now to *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida*, the last link in the chain of relationship which we have been tracing between the Victorian poet and his Basque admirer, we are struck at once by the impassioned quest for immortality that characterized both poets. Unamuno like Tennyson was one of those vigorous personalities to whom the thought of death as annihilation was especially repugnant. "En los fuertes, el ansia de perpetuidad sobrepuja a la duda de lograrla," he wrote, "y su rebose de vida se vierte al más allá de la muerte."[34] Clinging to the belief in personal immortality "contra el destino, y aun sin esperanza de victoria," he battled for this aspiration, to which he gave the supreme place in his religious speculation, *quijotescamente*, for without it life seemed a mockery.[35] An *angustia vital* compelled him to reject all

[32] *Ibid.*
[33] *E*, I, 919.
[34] *E*, II, 775.
[35] *E*, II, 390.

thought of losing consciousness of self in the Universal consciousness ("Deschacerse en el sueño sin ensueños del nirvana, . . . anegarme en el gran Todo").[36] His goal was the mystic goal of "taking possession of the God Power within him." His answer to the ills of existence, especially the threat of suicide, was the Platonic "plenitud de plenitudes, y todo plenitud," discussed in the essay of this title.[37]

Tennyson, too, in those moments of despair in which he questioned the worth of human existence, clung tenaciously to life:

> Whatever crazy sorrow saith,
> No life that breathes with human breath
> Has ever truly long'd for death.
>
> 'Tis life, whereof our nerves are scant,
> O life, not death, for which we pant;
> More life, and fuller, that I want.
>
> ("The Two Voices")

When waging his battle with negative evidence in *In Memoriam,* Tennyson could only fall back on "the larger hope" that the survival of the whole personality might yet be true. Indeed, without this hope, for which there was no rational support, the manifestations of beauty, order, and law became empty.

> My own dim life should teach me this,
> That life shall live for evermore,
> Else earth is darkness at the core,
> And dust and ashes all that is.
>
> (xxxiv, 1-4)

Nor could the British poet accept the semipantheistic idea of personal consciousness merging into the Cosmic Soul.

> That each, who seems a separate whole,
> Should move his rounds, and fusing all
> The skirts of self again, should fall
> Remerging in the general Soul,
>
> Is faith as vague as all unsweet!
> Eternal form shall still divide
> The eternal soul from all beside;
> And I shall know him when we meet.
>
> (xlvii, 1-8)

Thus acceptance of the doctrine of evolution gave stability to the Victorian's hopes for a future existence. In the afterlife there would be no rest, no standstill, even as Unamuno set forth in *Juan Manso.* For Tennyson, life beyond the grave, like life on earth, was moving forward towards the manifestation of the ultimate perfection of Self-Conscious Spirit.

---

[36] *E,* II, 771.

[37] The motif of suicide appears in *Amor y pedagogía, Niebla,* and "Un pueblo suicida," *Por tierras de Portgual y España*; "Coimbra," *Andanzas y visiones,* and "José Asunción Silva," *E,* II, 1057.

We can conclude, I think, on the basis of the foregoing discussion, that a spiritual kinship is discernible between the dissenter of Salamanca and the Victorian "rebel," to use Eliot's phrase. The relationship, in my opinion, can hardly be called an affinity between Unamuno's "franqueza y primitivismo vascongados" and the "realismo práctico aun en literatura de los ingleses." The oneness is rather that of religious experience, of mystic aspiration outside the pale of dogma and ritual, of prophetic vision given lyrical form. Obviously, the precise place to be assigned Tennyson's poetry in the evolution of the religious concepts which, judging from their writings, the two artists held in common, is part of a larger issue, that of openness to Protestant thought and feeling of the nineteenth century as a whole, and, insofar as the poetry of the English romanticists is concerned, the influence of Hegel, which was operative early in the thought of Unamuno. Kinship with Tennyson in the deepest sense appears to have been one means of experiencing the humanistic ideal, *totalizarse*, upheld earlier by Fray Luis de León, and to be sought, according to Unamuno, through exercise of the creative imagination.

> Consiste la perfección de las cosas [wrote Fray Luis in *De los nombres de Cristo*—the passage is quoted in *De mística y humanismo*] en que cada uno de nosotros sea un mundo perfecto, para que por esta manera, estando todos en mí y yo en todos los otros, y teniendo yo su ser de todos ellos y todos y cada uno dellos el ser mío, se abrace y eslabone toda aquesta máquina del Universo, y se reduzca a unidad la muchedumbre de sus diferencias, y quedando no mezcladas se mezclen, y permaneciendo muchas no lo sean; y para que extendiéndose y como desplegándose delante los ojos la variedad y diversidad, venza y reine y ponga su silla la unidad sobre todo.

This passage represents not only the formula of national rebirth proclaimed by Unamuno in 1895 but the guiding principle for attaining the full stature of his own humanity. Sharing in the religious experience of Tennyson, as in those of Kierkegaard, Sénancour, Pascal, and a host of others, he enriched his treasure of associations—which has rightly been said to constitute the essence of the humanistic ideal.

The inspiration of the spiritual *totalizarse* became vital for Unamuno, especially during the closing years of the nineteenth century when, as aftermath of his religious crisis, he was seeking new channels of creative expression congenial to his intimate experiences. The English poets who had treated personal religious beliefs in their poetry, Tennyson especially, who in *In Memoriam* and other lyrics shared with the world the drama of his soul, opened the pathway for a reorientation of Unamuno's literary ideal, a reorientation for which contemporary Spanish life offered scant incentive.

González Caminero has expressed surprise to find no author of the psychological or ideological caliber of Ibsen, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Sénancour, Pascal, Carducci, and others, characterized by Unamuno

as "pensadores y sentidores de la tragedia de la vida," among the English writers with whom he was familiar. A reappraisal of Tennyson by post-Victorian critics such as T. S. Eliot, W. H. Auden, and E. D. Johnson renders more apparent the underlying *agonismo* of the English poet. Auden comments:

> Two questions: Who am I? Why do I exist? and the panic fear of their remaining unanswered—doubt is much too intellectual and tame a term for such a vertigo of anxiety—seem to have obsessed him [Tennyson] all his life. Why he should have felt them so strongly and at such an early age we cannot, of course, know, but it seems not unlikely that his experience was similar to one described by Kierkegaard in his Journals.[38]

Johnson's discussion of the dream, the vision, madness, and the quest[39] as insistent motifs in the life of the imagination as portrayed by Tennyson points to a line of investigation which would likewise prove of interest in the further pursuit of the kinship of the two poets. These lines of approach would establish more conclusively, I think, that, even as French inspiration lay back of the aesthetic reform which made of Rubén Darío, as Juan Ramón Jiménez has said, "el revolucionario de fuera," so the "marvellous lyrical poetry of the English," which from William Blake on sought to explore the world of spirit as a venture of the individual soul, provided the impetus, quoting again the words of Jiménez, for Unamuno's role as a "revolucionario de dentro."

University of California, Los Angeles

---

[38] *Tennyson: An Introduction and a Selection* (London, 1946), p. xvi.

[39] W. T. Stace begins his illuminating study of the basic oneness of the mystic or numinous experience in East and West, *Time and Eternity*, with Whitehead's definition of religion as "the Vision of something which stands beyond, behind, and within, the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real, and yet waiting to be realized... something which is the ultimate ideal, and the hopeless quest."

NEW ENGLAND IN LESYA UKRAINKA'S *IN THE WILDERNESS*

CLARENCE A. MANNING

THE eminence of Lesya Ukrainka (1872-1913) as perhaps the greatest Ukrainian poetess rests largely upon her dramatic poems and poetic dramas. Almost none of these employ subjects drawn from Ukrainian life, but they all deal with problems confronting the Ukrainian people.[1] It is always easy to see a relevance for Ukrainian life in the numerous themes this author draws from other cultures and civilizations, especially of the ancient world.

Few great writers have been so dependent upon literary sources. From childhood Lesya Ukrainka suffered from tuberculosis of the bone and was forced to live as an invalid and almost as a recluse. Her mother and her uncle, Michael Drahomanov, a famous professor of sociology at the University of Kiev, taught her the classical languages as well as those of Western Europe. She had a wide knowledge of ancient and modern literature and it was natural for her, under the circumstances, to express her ardent Ukrainian patriotism through subjects drawn from her reading rather than directly from Ukrainian life.

The scene of her three-act dramatic poem, *In the Wilderness*, is laid in seventeenth-century Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The plot is very simple. Richard Ayron (the name is obviously an attempt to transliterate Iron into Ukrainian), after studying sculpture in Italy, comes to Massachusetts. His devotion to his art arouses Puritan prejudices and he is compelled to leave the colony. He goes to Rhode Island as a teacher; but here the commercial and unintellectual atmosphere makes him lose his confidence in himself, and when he is offered a chance to return to Italy he no longer has the desire or the will to do so. He is content to stay and face a drab future and impending death. His is the tragedy of a wasted talent.

Lesya Ukrainka completed Acts I and III by 1898. She added Act II in 1907 when, in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution in 1905, the Black Hundreds were "restoring order" in Russia and Ukraine by mob action and violence. At this time she made verbal changes in the older sections but did not alter her conception of the characters. The author seems to have utilized her own experience in creating the character of Richard. In her previous work her style was so different from that of the older, ethnographic school of Ukrainian authors, who dealt

[1] *The Boyar Woman* and *The Forest Song* are exceptional in their use of Ukrainian subjects.

almost exclusively with the life of the Ukrainian village, that she had not received proper recognition. Hence her sympathy for the poor artist.

In a broader sense, Richard personifies Ukraine and its writers. The tsarist decree of 1876 had made it almost impossible to publish books in Ukrainian. Richard's plight in Massachusetts was similar to that of Ukrainian authors, who were forced to be silent or to write in Russian, or else to risk exile in Siberia. The harm done to Richard in Rhode Island was similar to that suffered by those Ukrainians who sought safety in inoffensive pursuits and became so absorbed in petty affairs that they were never able to realize their ideals or "dreams," as Richard puts it again and again.

The hatred that the archpersecutor Godwinson feels for sculpture is not based merely on the historical neglect of the fine arts among the Puritans. It is pointed at Moscow. The Russian archconservative of the seventeenth century, Archpriest Avvakum, had used similar language against the newer forms of ikons and everything that resembled sculpture in any way. Lesya selected from the New England setting motifs that would serve to contrast the cheerful Ukrainians and the dour Russians.

What was the source utilized by Lesya Ukrainka for her description of New England? One of the most distinguished students of her work, P. Filipovych (later liquidated by the Communists) pointed out that she was at one time interested in writing a biography of John Milton, a work she never finished, which doubtless led her to study both Puritanism and Milton's Italy. It is also known that her uncle, Drahomanov, had planned a book on Roger Williams. He gave her the unfinished manuscript when she was with him in Bulgaria at the time of his death in 1895. This evidence remains somewhat vague.

But it is possible to go further in identifying the source of the dramatic poem. Lesya Ukrainka herself gives us a clue. After the list of dramatis personae she adds: "The action takes place in a small ephemeral colony in Massachusetts, the last act in Rhode Island." The word "ephemeral" is important. In general, the Puritan settlements were extraordinarily solid and permanent. There was, however, one ephemeral settlement, that of Merrymount, an un-Puritan colony established not far from Boston in the seventeenth century. Its fate is described by Nathaniel Hawthorne in "The Maypole of Merrymount," one of the *Twice-Told Tales*. In actual history, Merrymount was founded on Mount Wollaston in Quincy by Thomas Morton in 1629 as a center for revelry and sports. It soon attracted the unfavorable attention of Governor John Endicott, who summarily destroyed it and expelled Morton from the province.

In Hawthorne's story there are several passages which suggest episodes in Lesya Ukrainka's dramatic poem. While sculpture is not

specifically mentioned, the masques of the revellers of Merrymount were molded.

> On the shoulders of a comely youth arose the head and branching antlers of a stag; a second, human in all other points, had the grim visage of a wolf; a third, still with the trunk and limbs of a mortal man, showed the beard and horns of a venerable he-goat. There was the likeness of a bear erect, brute in all but his hind legs, which were adorned with pink silk stockings... Other faces wore the similitude of man or woman, but distorted or extravagant, with red noses pendulous before their mouths, which seemed of awful depth, and stretched from ear to ear in an eternal fit of laughter... At harvest time, though their crop was of the smallest, they made an image with the sheaves of Indian corn, and wreathed it with autumnal garlands, and bore it home triumphantly [there were similar Ukrainian harvest rites practiced in the villages]... There were the silken colonists, sporting round their Maypole; perhaps teaching a bear to dance, or striving to communicate their mirth to the grave Indian.

The atmosphere of Merrymount is contrasted with that of the Puritans, for

> Not far from Merrymount was a settlement of Puritans, most dismal wretches, who said their prayers before daylight, and then wrought in the forest or cornfield till evening made it prayer time again. Their weapons were always at hand to shoot down the straggling savage. When they met in conclave, it was never to keep up the old English mirth but to hear sermons three hours long, or to proclaim bounties on the heads of wolves and the scalps of Indians. Their festivals were fast days, and their chief pastime the singing of psalms. Woe to the youth or maiden who did but dream of a dance! The selectman nodded to the constable; and there sat the light-heeled reprobate in the stocks; or if he danced, it was round the whipping post, which might be termed the Puritan Maypole.

These details reappear in Lesya Ukrainka's work in different forms and with different connotations. Hawthorne was himself of Puritan stock and, while he could at times criticize the rigors of the old system, he valued its good sides. He stressed the Puritan love of freedom in such stories as "The Gray Champion." He emphasized in almost every work his ethical and religious ideas, and Dostoevsky himself would have appreciated his awareness of the results of human sin. Lesya Ukrainka was of a different fiber. Art and patriotism dominated her work. To her the mere mention of a rigid regime brought up pictures of Russian life as distinct from Ukrainian. The harsh etiquette of the Muscovites in *The Boyar Woman* and the rigid code of Madrid in *The Stone Guest* both served her as examples of the spirit of Moscow and Russia. And so did the Puritans.

She depicts Richard as a sculptor of a high type, a man devoted to art in the highest and purest sense of the word. He will not, like his friend Jonathan, turn to safe and popular subjects for gain—such as the carving of figureheads for ships. At the same time Richard wishes to fulfill his social obligations as he sees them. In order to build a home for the wife of Rivers, before autumn comes on, he disobeys an order from the elders for all hands in the village to build a special house for

Godwinson. This order and the form in which it is expressed are characteristically Russian, typical of that flattery of the supposedly great that seemed to Lesya a part of the Russian code. Besides, the order savors more of the compulsory labor imposed by a Russian landowner or his overseer than of New England's neighborly cooperation and mutual help.

Richard's modeling is opposed by his mother and sister. In Act II he is modeling an Indian girl, a type of occupation that might have occurred at Merrymount but not in a Puritan village of the time. His nephew, Davie, makes out of bread a grotesque statuette of Godwinson. "He has long skirts, round-headed with a book in his hands, a wide mouth from ear to ear and his ears, you see, stick out." Godwinson himself "wears a long skirted costume something like that of a scholar or clergyman" (this dress, something like a cassock, belongs to Russia rather than to New England).

Later Davie says, "I would like to model them all, old woman Stockley, like an owl in great spectacles, who won't let us play ball on Sunday, smooth Dick, when he sings a hymn, wrinkling his face like a baked apple"; and he explains to Richard that he likes this "because it is funny" and he does not care particularly for the beautiful. This is the mood of Merrymount.

There is the same similarity with a difference in the destinies of Merrymount and of Richard. Endicott says: "Wherefore, bind the heathen crew, and bestow on them a small number of stripes apiece, as earnest of our future justice. Set some of the rogues in the stocks to rest themselves, so soon as Providence shall bring us to one of our well-ordered settlements, where such accommodations may be found. Further penalties, such as branding and cropping of the ears, shall be thought of hereafter." When Ancient Palfrey asks the number of the stripes to be given the priest, the stern Puritan answers: "None as yet. It must be for the Great and General Court to determine, whether stripes and long imprisonment, and other grievous penalty, may atone for his transgressions. Let him look to himself! For such as violate our civil order, it may be permitted us to show mercy. But woe to the wretch that troubleth our religion." Then in a sense he pardons the young couple, after ordering the cropping of Edgar's hair. "There be qualities in the youth, which may make him valiant to fight, and sober to toil, and pious to pray; and in the maiden, that may fit her to become a mother in our Israel, bringing up babes in better nurture than her own hath been."

There is a hint of a similar procedure in the work of Lesya Ukrainka. Caleb Paddington says to Richard (p. 82): "You have become angry in vain. It is true that we have not called you into court, but have thought it best to come to you first to see how you live, and to interro-

gate you. There is all kinds of talk about you." Later he says: "There are bad rumors about you, that you go around with savages in the wilderness and bring them here."

The obstinacy of Richard in defending his work and the religious bigotry of Godwinson induce the group of Puritans to give up any idea of a formal trial. Instead, like the Russian Black Hundreds and their pogroms, they destroy Richard's statues, drive him forth with wild cries, and pelt him with clods and sticks.

Godwinson declares that the Puritans fought "for the word of God! the will of the community!" But Lesya's Caleb explains "that neither the king nor Parliament dares to break the judgment of the community. The community is a free and independent body." This is quite in the spirit of the Russian view of the community as an organized entity. For the Puritans and Hawthorne, of course, the judgment of the General Court was the will of the community, and the General Court under the Puritan conception of the English law was the representative of Parliament and the bulwark of freedom.

Lesya Ukrainka's attitude toward the Puritans is now clear. She pictures the bigotry and narrowmindedness of Puritan culture. She chooses precisely those passages in "The Maypole of Merrymount" which indicate the pet aversions of Puritan Massachusetts and applies them to Ukraine, disregarding many of the essential features of Puritan philosophy. She gives her judgments a Russian coloring, and fails to see that, back of the Puritan sternness and narrowness, there was a respect for the ideas that she herself held.

The scenes that she lays in Rhode Island are historically still less accurate or plausible. Rhode Island was first settled in 1636 to foster more religious liberty than was possible in Massachusetts. Roger Williams was an advanced thinker for the times, a highly educated man before he came to the colonies, who sought freedom rather than obedience. This is not indicated in the Ukrainian play; Rhode Island is depicted as lacking even the ideals of the Puritans. Hardly a scene even remotely suggests seventeenth-century American life.

Richard is shown as teaching a class in Italian. Historically, this is extremely unlikely, if not impossible. So too is Charlie's return of Richard's statue, since none of the customers of his father's shop wish to buy it. A curiosity is Brookley, the seamstress, who wishes the statue merely to use it as a mannekin—in a society which was to clothe itself in homespun for decades to come.

These anachronisms reach their height in Richard's discussion with the organist and the Magister. In the seventeenth century there was practically no music in the northern colonies except the singing of psalms and the martial fife and drum. The early Baptists, like the Puritans, were not interested in such questions as whether music was more

universal than sculpture. The splendid sounds of the organ and the offer to play the *Stabat Mater* carry us into the late eighteenth or even the nineteenth century.

Lesya Ukrainka treats Rhode Island as an almost modern European commercial city where ideals have been eliminated by the crassest philistinism. It is a place where Richard's dreams cannot flourish; and this drab but prosperous community completes his intellectual and artistic ruin. His stubborn belief in the sanctity of his art and his unwillingness to use it for base and practical purposes make him hate his environment, even as he is being crushed by it. He makes it clear to Messer Antonio that he cannot return to Italy for new inspiration. He looks back with longing, but he cannot return.

Despite Hawthorne's questioning of the value of Italian culture because of its beauty, its Roman Catholic character, and its artificiality, he (like Milton) felt its charm, and long before he went to Italy he was under its spell, as he shows in several stories. Here he agrees with Lesya Ukrainka and her love for the ancient world.

Lesya Ukrainka undoubtedly had a wide knowledge of the American scene in the seventeenth century, especially Massachusetts, thanks to Hawthorne and other American writers. She knew what she wanted to choose from this material. Her play depicts the tragedy of a man who sacrifices everything to the highest ideals of art, who dares to risk persecution by the bigots, and who is worn down by the sterile influence of the banal and the tawdry. It is intended as the tragedy of an oppressed people. *In the Wilderness* is the only important work in Ukrainian or Russian literature which draws upon the complex history of early America.

Columbia University

BROWNING'S "CLEON" AND AUGUSTE COMTE

EDWARD C. MCALEER

AGAIN and again Robert Browning used his poetic gifts to expose the errors of his contemporaries, to plead the cause of the Hebraic-Christian tradition as opposed to what he considered the erroneous little systems of his day. This tendency to reply, a tendency responsible for a good deal of his verse, did not allow him to leave unchallenged the pretensions of the Positivist religion of Auguste Comte. Comte's early work was largely philosophical, and had an important influence on subsequent philosophical development; but his later work was concerned, for the most part, with establishing his "Religion of Humanity." It was to this religious element in Comte's work that Browning took exception.

In 1848 Comte founded his Positivist Society in Paris, and the movement spread to England and America, where it still survives in Brazil. Externally the religion resembled Catholicism ("Catholicism minus Christianity," Huxley called it) with an ingenious adaptation of Catholic ritual to the new cult. The Positivists founded chapels, adorned them with busts of their saints, and held ritualistic services, which included the singing of Positivist hymns. Among Browning's friends who embraced Positivism were Harriet Martineau and G. H. Lewes, both translators of Comte; George Eliot, author of a Positivist hymn; and Mrs. Sutherland Orr, subsequently Browning's biographer.

In 1849 Comte published his *Positivist Calendar,* a reformed calendar of thirteen twenty-eight-day months, each month named after a great man whose work had benefited Humanity, and each day dedicated to a Positivist saint, that is to say, a person who had contributed to civilization. In 1852 he published his *Catéchisme positiviste, ou Sommaire exposition de la religion universelle, en onze entretiens systématiques entre une femme et un prêtre de l'humanité.*

The two most important dogmas of the new religion were concerned with the nature of God and the nature of immortality. According to the new dogma, the only Supreme Being which man can possibly know is Humanity itself. The divine-human soul of Humanity is one composite organism, consisting of, and transcending, all individuals who have ever lived. "Pour y parvenir," the priest replies to his catchumen's question regarding the *vrai Grande-Être,* "vous devez, ma fille, définir d'abord l'Humanité comme *l'ensemble* des êtres humains, passés, futurs, et présents."[1] Humanity, although imperfect, improves from generation to generation as the result of those who have served mankind. Browning

[1] Auguste Comte, *Catéchisme positiviste* (Paris, 1852), p. 30.

disposed of this dogma in "Ben Karshook's Wisdom" (dated 1854). When a Sadducee asked,

> "Is it so certain we
> Have, as they tell us, souls?"
>
> "Son, there is no reply!"
> The Rabbi bit his beard;
> "Certain, a soul have *I*—
> *We* may have none," he sneer'd.

As regards immortality, the Positivists did not believe in a conscious life hereafter, but did believe in an immortality defined in the opening lines of George Eliot's Positivist hymn,

> O, may I join the choir invisible
> Of those immortal dead who live again
> In minds made better by their presence . . .
> So to live is heaven.

Man lives again in those that will succeed him; he should attempt to make a contribution to posterity and leave behind him works that may increase the happiness of mankind. Comte's priest explains it thus:

> Pour la mieux concevoir, il faut distinguer, chez chaque vrai serviteur de l'Humanité, deux existences successives: l'une, temporaire mais directe, constitue la vie proprement dite; l'autre, indirecte mais permanente, ne commence qu'après la mort. La première étant toujours corporelle, elle peut être qualifiée d'*objective*; surtout par contraste envers la seconde, qui, ne laissant subsister chacun que dans le cœur et l'esprit d'autrui, mérite le nom de *subjective*. Telle est la noble immortalité nécessairiement immatérielle, que le positivisme reconnait à notre *âme*, en conservant ce terme précieux pour désigner l'ensemble des fonctions intellectuelles et morales, sans aucune allusion à l'entité correspondante.[2]

In "Cleon" (1855) Browning undertook a discussion of these two dogmas. The poem takes the form of an epistle from Cleon, a fictitious Greek artist and a contemporary of St. Paul's, replying to Protus, his fictitious king; it is itself a sort of catechism containing Protus's questions and Cleon's answers. It may be divided into six parts: salutation (lines 1-4), introduction (5-42), replies to Protus's first question (43-157), second question (158-272), third question (273-335), and postscript (336-353). The body of the letter, replying to the three questions, is concerned with the presentation and refutation of the Positivist religion; the postscript ironically presents the true solution, Christianity.

The first reply assures Protus that what he has heard is true: Cleon has distinguished himself in epic, lyric, sculpture, painting, anatomy, philosophy, and music. "In brief," says Cleon, "all arts are mine." He has not reached the individual heights of Terpander, Homer, Phidias, or Pericles (the last three being Positivist saints); yet he has "entered into sympathy / With these four, running these into one soul, / Who, separate, ignored each other's art."

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
AUG 18 1956
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

> We of these latter days, with greater mind
> Than our forerunners, since more composite,
> Look not so great, beside their simple way
> To a judge who only sees one way at once...
> Compares the small part of a man of us
> With some whole man of the heroic age,
> Great in his way—not ours, nor meant for ours.
> And ours is greater, had we skill to know:
> For... This sequence of the soul's achievements here
> Being... Intended to be viewed eventually
> As a great whole, not analyzed to parts,
> But each part having reference to all,—...
> Mankind, made up of all the single men,
> In such a synthesis the labour ends.

Here Cleon follows Comte in his concept of "Mankind made up of all the single men." He is also Comtean in his concept of progress as attributable to the efforts of Humanity: grapes, plums, flowers, honey have improved with human culture; even the female slave refines upon the women of his youth.

The second reply is to Protus's question whether Cleon may not be said to have attained "the very crown and proper end of life," and, as an artist, to fear death less than does Protus, a mere man of action. "For," Protus had written,

> "Thou leavest much behind, while I leave nought.
> Thy life stays in the poems men shall sing,
> The pictures men shall study; while my life,
> Complete and whole now in its power and joy,
> Dies altogether with my brain and arm."

Cleon cannot agree. Tracing what he calls "life's mechanics" and what Comte calls the "biologic hierarchy" from the shell that "sucks fast the rock" to man, he concludes that man alone is doomed to failure by virtue of the final gift of Zeus, the introactive quality of consciousness. Consciousness gives man an appetite for joy, a joy-hunger, but the appetite cannot be satisfied.

In his third question Protus had suggested the possibility of a Comtean immortality. Is not the joy-hunger capable of satisfaction to one with artist-gifts because his poem or his painting lives?

> "what
> Thou writest, paintest, stays; that does not die:
> Sappho survives, because we sing her songs,
> And Aeschylus, because we read his plays!"

Cleon has nothing but contempt for such a concept of immortality, which involves tripping on the mere word *survives*. Sappho and Aeschylus (though Positivist saints) do not live.

> Why, if they live still, let them come and take
> Thy slave in my despite, drink from thy cup,
> Speak in my place.

The fate of the artist is even deadlier than that of the common man, for the artist's sense of joy is more acute, and, though his work lives, he himself must die.

> It is so horrible,
> I dare at times imagine to my need
> Some future state revealed to us by Zeus . . .
> But no!
> Zeus has not yet revealed it; and alas,
> He must have done so, were it possible!

The postscript contains a brief, offhand dismissal of Protus's inquiries about St. Paul. How could the king think that a mere barbarian Jew had access to a secret shut from the Greek philosophers? Certain slaves had been preaching Paul and Christ on Cleon's island, but (he gathered from a bystander) "Their doctrine could be held by no sane man." The irony of Cleon's position is, of course, not known to him: Zeus has not revealed the immortality for which Cleon's soul hungers, yet the revelation has indeed been made and is being preached by those very slaves whom he will not hear. But there is an additional, subtler, irony in the fact that he is denied even the pale immortality of Positivism. Although in his own day he was pre-eminent in all the arts and in philosophy, there survives not an Ozymandian fragment of his works to admit him to the "choir invisible Of those immortal dead who live again In minds made better by their presence."[3]

University of Virginia

[3] There are a few, perhaps coincidental, parallels between Cleon and Comte himself. Comte had devoted himself to all the sciences; Cleon to all the arts. Comte had fathered one new science, sociology; Cleon had invented one new mode of music. Both had written books on religion or the soul, "proving absurd all written hitherto."

BOOK REVIEWS

ALLGEMEINE STILISTIK. By Herbert Seidler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953. 366 p.

This book, which grew out of a *Habilitationsschrift*, is an ambitious attempt at a codification of German research (by authors such as Winkler, Seidler's teacher, Ammann, Weisgerber, Porzig, Pongs, etc.) in that kind of stylistics which is based on Charles Bally's differentiation between the intellectual and the emotional as expressed by language—the emotional being declared the domain proper to stylistics. Style, according to Seidler's definition, is the emotional quality inherent or latent in *any* given linguistic utterance and in *all* its elements (phonetic, semantic, syntactic), not merely an author's deviations from the usual conventions of a language, although these deviations may be used to demonstrate the latency of stylistic values in the language.

There exists then a definable stylistic value of the noun or the verb, of the subjunctive or the indicative, of vowels and consonants, onomatopoeias, etc.—and it is these "generic" stylistic components that are pointed out in this treatise on "general" stylistics. Although most of the examples are drawn from German poets or prose writers, the stylistic values discussed are considered as valid for other languages also. The book is divided into four parts: an introduction to the theory of style, a chapter entitled "Language as Transformation [Gestaltung] of the Empirical World," in which vocabulary, grammatical forms, phrases, and sentences are studied; a chapter on "Language as Phonation [Lautung]," treating phonetic symbolism, rhythm and melody, phonetic *Gestalt*, etc.; and a last chapter, bearing the untranslatable title, "Die höheren Wirkungsgestalten," which deals with such variegated matters as evocation of milieu by style, imagery, and symbolism, the style of a work of art, and the classification of different styles.

Since it is our author's conviction that emotional elements are latent *everywhere* in a language, what he offers us is, as it were, a treatment of "the style" inherent in grammar, a grammar of style based on the "Gemüthaftigkeit" or the "Gefühlswert" of the elements of the language. Derivatives of these two German word families are repeated *ad nauseam* throughout the book.

My first impression is that, in this radical "stylisticization" of the whole language, the concept of style has been extended far beyond what we are accustomed to mean by this term; in Seidler's usage it sometimes seems to cover even poetic invention. Seidler compares (p. 89) the following two versions of a poem by Brentano—

(a) "Die Türme blinken helle,
Und froh der grüne Wald
Von tausend bunten Stimmen
In lautem Sang erschallt."

(b) "Die Türme blinken sonnig,
Es rauscht der grüne Wald,
In wildentbrannten Weisen
Der Vogelsang erschallt"

—and states that, while the rhythmical scheme, the sound material, the syntax, and the grouping of words are the same, the "word material" and consequently the stylistic values implied in them are changed. In my opinion, when "brightly shining towers" have been replaced by "sunlike shining towers," *content*—which is not identical with style—has been changed. From the common adage that "con-

tent is inseparable from form" (a statement which may be true from the poet's point of view) we must not infer that content no longer exists or must be dissolved into style—for otherwise Genesis and the *Celestina* would only differ in "style," or, to say it bluntly, the term "style" would have become entirely meaningless. Again, on p. 296 Seidler, contrasting a description of a landscape by Stifter with one by Novalis, finds that in the first all the forms of the objects stand out with clear-cut contours, while in the second there is pictured a more blurred, changing landscape that makes the mood of the beholder change also—obviously, we again have to do with "content," not "style."

Another objection, which strikes at the very basis of Seidler's stylistics, is that, in the present stage of traditional descriptive grammar, we are far from being able to build a grammar of stylistics. We rarely know, e.g., in spite of all the existing literature on the subject, what the exact role of the definite article actually is in any of the different languages that possess this article, and are unable to compare the use of that element in the different languages (the nuance of Fr. *l'ami Fritz* is quite different from It. *l'amico Fritz*; the letterhead on stationery of my university says *The Johns Hopkins University* while continental universities call themselves *Université de Paris, Università degli studi di Firenze*). Still less are we able to define the "action on feeling" that the definite article exerts on speakers of the different languages. Sometimes Seidler himself seems afraid of his own sweeping statements: "The [stylistic] content of the (German) subjective seems to me clear: a process is seen as though through a veil" (p. 145)—one notices the smuggling in of the word "German" in a parenthesis which invalidates most glaringly the asserted generality of the statement. While one's own mother tongue can often be studied as a representative of the phenomena of "language" in general, the particular behavior of the mother tongue in a particular construction cannot safely be assumed to be representative of other languages. And what a weak, semipoetic, ultimately meaningless label: "a process seen through a veil"! The question is why the speaker of a certain language should wish to veil his statements!

In general, the formulations of our author, which depend almost exclusively on German word material and on the work of German stylisticians, may be exceedingly difficult for a foreign reader to grasp, the more so since they are often couched in that high-sounding metaphysical solemnity of pompous vagueness, out of all proportion to content, that we have come to associate with German prose writing of the last two decades—of which Heidegger's cryptic formulation, espoused by our author, "Dichtung ist worthafte Stiftung des Seins" (in more prosaic wording: poetry creates by its words a new reality), is the prototype.

To choose at random from Seidler's formulations: we have already met the phrase "die höheren Wirkungsgestalten"; a description by Trakl of servants sitting at their meal in a low-ceilinged, smoke-filled room is characterized (p. 190): "hier rollt wenn auch im kleinsten, ein Vorgang sprachlichen Weltgestaltens ab"; the archaic language of Kolbenheyer is said (p. 28) to evoke "urtümliche Lebensverbundenheit, gefühlsverhangene Beziehung zur Umwelt ..."; a poem of Hölderlin's is described by the sentence: "Ein großer Zug geht durch das Ganze, weil alle Beseelung aus einem großen Kraftstrom einer glühenden Dichterseele geboren ward." Such grandiloquence calls for Croce's witty admonishment to critics who themselves wax poetic: "Mitsingen ist verboten"—the more so since many of the contemporary poets so enthusiastically commented upon have not yet reached the stage of general recognition. Thus Jünger and Weinheber are enumerated (p. 327) along with Goethe and Rilke as "große Sprachkünstler, die um das Tiefste in der Sprache ringen." The contrived archaic style of Kolbenheyer in a passage of doubtful literary taste is discussed in a

dithyramb taking up four pages. And a dithyrambic style is sometimes applied to poetic passages whose excellence resides precisely in their simplicity; the lines of Hölderlin, "Die Dichter müssen auch / die geistigen weltlich sein," evoke the comment: "*Dichter müssen, geistig, weltlich* sind—nicht bloß Marken sondern sprachliche Weltgestaltungsschöpfungen" (*sic*!). The German words, *Dichter, müssen, geistig, weltlich*, may indeed be called "apperceptions of reality" (rather than *Weltgestaltung*, etc., etc.), but what has this fact to do with the simple statement of Hölderlin, expressed in the simplest possible manner, that poets, even the spiritual ones, should be worldly? When faced with such passages of supposedly critical prose on the meaning of words, we feel submerged in an ocean of words in which all meaning has disappeared.

In spite of these grave objections I should not like to give the impression that the author's earnestness in his metaphysical conception of language and his endeavor to grasp the emotional stylistic values of language lead to no result. On the contrary, we often find in this book new insights felicitously formulated. But what I find missing is that energetic intellectual filtering of intuitions, that self-criticism, that parsimonious use of words that would have been imperative had Seidler chosen to write for a Romance or Anglo-Saxon public. As it is, the book is hopelessly "provincial," a fact the more regrettable since the author's views are deeper than those of many students of language in less metaphysical-minded climates.

Here some critical remarks on detail may find their place:

Page 97: It is not true that suffixes were always originally separate words; the example of It. *cavallinuccio* proves precisely the contrary.

Page 98: The suffixes Germ. *-lein*, It. *-ino* are said to express a warm, cosy mood; Germ. *-chen*, It. *-etto* "eine etwas forschere, herbere [Stimmung]." The difference felt by the author between Germ. *-lein* and *-chen* is characteristic only for an Austrian, for whom *-lein* (and its variants *-l*, *-erl*, etc.) is the genuine, *-chen* the North German suffix. And to parallel these German suffixes with It. *-ino* and *-etto*, both equally genuine in Italian, is absolutely wrong. How could a typically Prussian epithet such as *forsch* apply to *anything* Italian?

Page 105: In order to show that the adjective generally entails a nuance of "being personally affected," Seidler offers the following example: If someone should undergo the terrible experience of having lost his eyesight, he would give form to that innermost feeling of being personally affected by exclaiming: "Blind!" But, if a blind person recovered his eyesight and his vital impulses reawoke, he would again feel adjusted to the fullness of life and exclaim: "I see!" How does Seidler know so well what, in two situations, each of which may have materialized perhaps once in a million cases, the persons concerned would say? The exact situation in each case would have to be the exact moment in which, let us say, a person awakes in the morning finding himself blind (or seeing again) and his kin (or a doctor) would have to be able to catch his very *first* spoken reaction, which would have to coincide with the first awareness by the patient of his altered state. My guess is that in both cases the form chosen would be verbal: (it seems to me) *I do not see*—(it seems to me) *I see again*. "Blind!" (or in the second case "No longer blind!") would be a second reaction in which the resulting situation would be stated, as if reflectively and as if the speaker emitted a judgment: "I belong then to the (well-known) category of the blind." It is characteristic that no adjective exists for "having recovered his eyesight"; obviously this is not a category that has found expression in *any* language.

Page 132: The passage from Stifter, "Es wurden losgegangene Bänder wieder geknüpft, im Gemüsegarten umgegraben, Fenster an Winterbeeten gelüftet . . . ," is

intended by Seidler to serve as an example for the capacity of the passive to evoke well-framed pictures in their "tranquil plenitude" (ruhende Fülle)—but I sense here also an overriding principle of orderly activity according to rule or pattern. The sentence does not effectuate "das Herausstoßen eines Erfahrungsstücks aus dem strömenden Lebenszusammenhang"; on the contrary, all those orderly activities are seen in a "Lebenszusammenhang."

Page 140: I am not sure of the rightness of the interpretation of the last two sentences of *Werther*: "Handwerker trugen ihn, kein Geistlicher hat ihn begleitet." According to Seidler, the perfect, as opposed to the preceding preterite, would be a leap toward the "firm ground of the present" from whose vantage point Goethe is looking back at the dreadful event described, which was at the point of rending his "bleeding heart." For me the perfect is a statement about the historical significance of the fact that Werther's death and funeral, the death and funeral of an eighteenth-century pantheist, occurred outside the pale of the church. There is surely involved in the perfect tense a certain coolness of intellectual appreciation of the happening from the point of view of the present, in contrast to the narrative that simply tells events; but the look into the past is to be interpreted less subjectively than Seidler interprets it.

Page 191: The stylistic contrast between two descriptions of violent events of war by Kleist and Stifter is identified by our author with Kleist's being dragged into the violence of the happenings, which are reflected in the agitated sentence structure, and Stifter's quiet, contemplative development of the scene and consequently of the sentence. But I sense also a difference between periodizing (with Kleist) and seriative juxtaposition (with Stifter). In other words, there exists with Kleist the tension between described violence and the mastering of the events by the author, while with Stifter there exists no such tension at all.

Page 249: The line, "das dumme Tier tats um des Reimes willen," is not by Arno Holz but by Christian Morgenstern.

Page 236: The remark that in Dumas Fils' *Dame aux camélias* the name of the lover, *Armando*, is spoken by Marguerite Gautier in a gamut of different moods leaves a Romance scholar baffled: *Armando* is Italian, not French. I suspect that Seidler heard from theatergoers of my vintage that Eleanora Duse, in the Italian version of Dumas' play, used to repeat in a crucial scene the name *Armando* with all the inflections of voice that contrasting emotions can elicit—it was that breath-taking recital of the famous actress that is said to have prompted Verdi to regret not having heard it before he composed the finale of one act of *La Traviata*.

Page 311: The symbol, as opposed to other imagery, is defined by Seidler, if I understand his obscure wording correctly, by *Hintergründigkeit*, by the presence, behind the meaning in the foreground, of a deeper meaning. Seidler, not being well read in non-Germanic critical literature, does not consider here the very enlightening remark by Baruzi, treating the mystic symbol in St. John of the Cross, that the symbolic value of a material object must *grow* before our eyes in the literary work; thus *Hintergründigkeit* is not enough for the presence of a symbol; it must impose itself *gradually* on us with increasing impact. This can be verified with the symbol of symbols, the Cross of Christ, as well as with the "wild duck" of Ibsen or the "sea gull" of Chekhov.

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

THE POETRY OF MEDITATION: A STUDY IN ENGLISH RELIGIOUS LITERATURE OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By Louis L. Martz. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954. xiv, 375 p.

With this book Mr. Martz has made an important contribution to one of the major tasks of contemporary literary history and criticism—the explication of the Metaphysical poets, their restoration (or ours) to contemporaneity. The problem seems to be the touchstone of our criticism, and Mr. Martz joins the distinguished company of Grierson, Eliot, and more recently Empson, Freeman, Tuve, and Summers,[1] to mention only a few. Both we and the poets are fortunate in the competence and intelligence of the critic-historians.

The assumption underlying Mr. Martz' study is the same critical position so capably and explicitly defended by Miss Tuve in *A Reading of George Herbert* (London, 1952), namely that "the repairing of ignorance [is] an accepted function of criticism" (p. 21), helping us to know as far as possible what the poet and his contemporaries knew, what the poet knew his contemporaries knew. Miss Tuve has shown us that Herbert's poetic language is rich in symbols from the liturgy and consequently intelligible to his contemporaries in terms of the liturgy. Continuing this kind of fruitful investigation, Mr. Martz's thesis is that Metaphysical poetry stands in a very close relationship to the "art of meditation," a discipline that encouraged the development of the qualities we associate specifically with Southwell, Donne, Herbert, and Crashaw. (He virtually limits his study to these principal figures.) It is his position that the symbols of Metaphysical poetry can recreate in us the complex experience that they record only if we are aware of the meaning of these symbols in their original, nonpoetic context in the practice of meditation.

Martz divides his study into two sections: Part I, "The Art of Meditation," and Part II, "Three Meditative Poets." The four chapters of Part I "explore the great variety of devotional practices that constitute the art of meditation," particularly "those aspects of meditation that may be called potential poetry: those aspects that provided a discipline and cultivated an outlook akin to that which we find expressed in English religious poetry of the seventeenth century." Part II "consider[s] in detail the work of... Southwell, Donne, and Herbert." The chief aim of Part II is to examine the many ways in which meditation seems to have coalesced with strictly poetical traditions of the Renaissance" (p. 21). Part I is preceded by an Introduction and Part II is followed by three appendices.

The Introduction reminds us in scholarly detail of the popularity of the handbooks and treatises on the devotional life in England in the seventeenth century. The writings of St. Ignatius, Luis de Granada, Luis de la Puente, St. François de Sales, and the English Jesuit Richard Gibbons among others were known to both Catholics and Anglicans. From Gibbons Martz draws a definition of a meditation,[2] which is then developed and refined (meditative being carefully distinguished from mystical) by quotations from the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century translations of continental writers.

Martz is then ready to study the structure of meditation (and of specific meditations) and to relate that structure to the poetry. The most general structure of a

[1] Joseph H. Summers, *George Herbert: His Religion and His Art* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954). That the Harvard and Yale presses should both publish studies in this field in the same year attests to the vitality of current interest.

[2] "Meditation which we treate of, is nothing els but a diligent and forcible application of the understanding, to seeke, and knowe, and as it were to taste some divine matter; from whence doth arise in our affectionate powers good motions, inclinations, and purposes which stirre us up to the love and exercise of vertue, and the hatred and avoiding of sinne" (p. 14).

meditation is a threefold sequence: (1) with memory and imagination to visualize with the greatest vivacity the object or quality of the meditation; (2) with the understanding to inquire and search out the verities; and (3) with the "freedom of the will to draw forth sundry Affections, or virtuous Acts, conformable to that which the Understanding has meditated" (I am quoting or paraphrasing passages from Puente). This structure of memory, understanding, and will Martz finds in Southwell's "New Prince, new pompe" and "Sinnes heavie loade," in Donne's "Holy Sonnets" (2, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15) and "Goodfriday, 1613. Riding Westward." The threefold structure underlies Crashaw's hymn, "To the Name above Every Name, the Name of Iesus," and Vaughn's "I walked the other day (to spend my hour)."

The study proceeds antiphonally as Martz brings forth text after text from the devotional literature describing in remarkable detail the structure of the poems themselves.[3] We must, I think, grant Mr. Martz his thesis: the Metaphysical poets were familiar with the disciplines of meditation, indeed had made the techniques their own to such a degree that the pattern of the meditation frequently informed their religious poetry, giving it the possibility of creating the complex, "total" experience of the meditation.

Chapter II, "Meditations on the Life of Christ" (and the Virgin Mary), and Chapter III, "Self-Knowledge: The Spiritual Combat," deal principally with the objects of meditation. The procedure is the same—passages from the instructions on the meditation of the life of Christ in juxtaposition with the poems (Southwell's "The Burning Babe," for example). The threefold pattern of meditation is, to be sure, not the only one, and in Chapter II Martz introduces the techniques for meditation by the rosary for the analysis of Donne's "La Corona" and Southwell's sequence on Mary and Christ. In the third chapter Martz discusses the search for self-knowledge that culminated in the *Spiritual Combat* attributed to Lorenzo Scupoli and St. François de Sales' *Introduction to the Devout Life*. One of the effects of this type of analysis was to develop detachment, "which enables the speaker in these poems to analyze a problem even while he participates in the dramatic action" (p. 130), and a "discipline essential—though not alone—in producing the peculiar, tense coexistence of conflicting elements under steady control, moving toward a predetermined end: the outstanding quality of all the finest achievements in English religious literature of the seventeenth century, from its shortest lyric to its grand epics in poetry and prose" (p. 135).

Mr. Martz is careful to point out that the techniques of meditation offered considerable latitude for temperamental variation, and that the expression by any one poet was highly individual. As an example, he contrasts the poems on death by Donne and Herbert: Donne's picture of the depravity and horror of death, associated with the Jesuit spirit of Puente, and Herbert's calm, mild acceptance of the inevitable, associated with the Salesian spirit.

The fourth chapter of Part I is entitled "Problems in Puritan Meditations: Richard Baxter." Baxter's espousal of the highly suspect practices of meditation was to be important for Puritan poets, although they were never to embrace the discipline without reservations. Martz discusses Milton's "Hymn on the Nativity" in the light of Puritan meditation, and compares it to Crashaw's. His conclusion is that "Milton puts last the concrete scene which would normally begin a Catholic meditation on the subject" (p. 165).

In concluding Part I, Martz says that "the second part of this study will range

[3] Herbert's less rigorous structure, Martz suggests, derives from the less formal spiritual discipline of St. François de Sales, for whom, as Martz shows in Part II, Herbert felt an extraordinary attraction.

beyond the strictly meditative; yet meditation remains, I believe, the vital center of this poetry" (p. 175). But there is to be a greater emphasis on the poetry. Adding "sacred parody"—the conversion of profane (Petrarchan) love poetry into poetry of divine love—to the meditative techniques already studied, Martz analyzes in the manner of the first part a number of poems by Southwell under the headings, "The Art of Sacred Parody," "Southwell and Herbert," "Southwell's Gnomic Verse," "The Literature of Tears," and "Self-Analysis in the Works of Southwell." Martz admits that Southwell does not always write successful poetry, but his bold attempts to make poetry serve "solemne and devout matter" prepared the way for the poets to come.

After a brief examination (Chapter VI) of "Sacred and Profane Love" in the poems of Donne, he turns his attention to the *Anniversaries*.

"The *Anniversaries*, then, were composed during a period when Donne appears to have been utilizing all the modes of meditation and self-analysis that he knew, in the effort to make the crucial decision of his life. It was a period when his weighing of the sacred and profane tendencies within himself must have reached a climax of intensity; and this, I believe, is why the two poems represent Donne's most elaborate examples of the art of sacred parody and his most extensive efforts in the art of poetical meditation" (p. 220).

There follows an elaborate analysis which finds, quite accurately, in each of the five sections of the *First Anniversary* a variation of the familiar threefold meditative sequence: meditation, eulogy, refrain and moral. The five sections reflect, Martz believes, the five daily exercises recommended in the Jesuit program, each exercise divided usually into three points.

The *Second Anniversary* is composed of seven sections (plus Introduction and Conclusion), the first two reproducing the pattern of the *First Anniversary*, i.e., meditation, eulogy, moral. The remaining five consist only of meditation and eulogy. Martz' general comment on the poem is that "Donne's *Second Anniversary* presents seven meditations which may be called, for the most part, a description of the 'defaced image,' the Land of Unlikeness; while the seven Eulogies, for the most part, create a symbol of the original Image and Likeness, the lost beauty and nobility that must not be forgotten" (p. 240); its central theme is "the true end of man."

In his Appendix 2, Martz argues convincingly that Donne wrote the *First Anniversary* (or *Anatomie*) in November 1611 for the first anniversary of the death of Elizabeth Drury (d. December 1610), and the *Second Anniversary* (or *Progresse*) sometime near December 1611. "I take it that the term "anniversary," as applied to these poems, indicates a whole year's commemorative tribute, paid in advance" (p. 354). He rejects the suggestion made by Miss Nicolson and Mr. Bewley that there is a reference to Queen Elizabeth. No, says Martz, "he is celebrating the values of 'interior peace'" (p. 356).

The last two chapters of the book are devoted to George Herbert. Chapter VII considers Herbert's response to lively forces in the spiritual and literary life of the seventeenth century: Sidney's influence in Herbert's movement "from elaboration (Donne) to restraint," the Psalms as "prime models for the soul in meditation," the holy *simplicitas* of Savonarola, the *Imitation of Christ*, but above all the wonderfully deep and gentle spirit of St. François de Sales. Concerning "The Unity of *The Temple*" (Chapter VIII) Martz comes to the following conclusions: "Herbert's *Temple* displays a structure built upon the art of mental communion, and so designed, beyond any doubt, by George Herbert himself" (p. 288). And concerning the order of the poems: "Herbert has taken pains to avoid any obvious, easy arrangement: chronological, thematic, or otherwise; and for reasons justified by

the total implications of the *Temple* itself. The spiritual life (the *Temple* seems to say) will not fall into such easy patterns: its unity is deeper and richer than this; and therefore the beauty and harmony that Herbert sees in the book which was, for him, incomparably the greatest of all books does not lie in such arrangements, but rather in the subtle, 'dispersed' 'configurations'" (p. 296).

In his Appendix 1, Martz examines the relationship between Johannes Mauburnus' *Rosetum* (1494), Joseph Hall's *The Arte of Divine Meditation* (1606), and Crashaw's hymn "To the Name above Every Name, the Name of Iesus" (1648).

Appendix 3 is a bibliography (to which should be added the book by Joseph Summers noted earlier), divided into three sections (for our easier meditation): A. Works of the Poets, B. Devotional Works, C. Secondary Writings.

In his Conclusion Martz asks whether it is possible to describe a "meditative style," and his answer is yes, if we "work from the essence to the accident, from the deepest inner being of the writer and the poem, outward" (p. 321). It is not a style limited to religious poets of the seventeenth century, for it is seen in Hopkins and Yeats. In a beautiful sentence Mr. Martz gives an essential and universal condition for meditative poetry: "It must be a self that speaks constantly in the presence of the supernatural, that feels the hand of the supernatural upon himself and upon all created things."

Mr. Martz proposes a thesis, namely that there is a poetry of meditation which is the poetic response to the spiritual disciplines deriving from St. Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises,* and defends this thesis with the soundest scholarship. He may be right that it is more accurate to speak of poetry of meditation then of Metaphysical poetry, although I suspect that the term Metaphysical will remain. The author's knowledge of the large body of devotional literature of the Counter-Reformation is thorough, and responds admirably to his need. I mean that the parallels between the treatises and the poems are real parallels. The poems *are* meditations.

Mr. Martz has made an extraordinarily valuable contribution to our knowledge of both the poetic process and the poetic result not only of the Metaphysical poets in England but of religious poetry and poets on the continent, a subject which remains to be examined in detail. It is immediately apparent to the student of Spanish literature that the techniques of meditation have informed a great many of the religious poems of Lope de Vega, Quevedo, etc., which is to say that religious literature of the Counter-Reformation is European in many of its characteristics rather than national. To illuminate one corner is to throw light upon the whole room.

The Poetry of Meditation is not an easy book to read. The continual and necessary shifting of attention from treatise to poem back to treatise eventually fatigues the spirit; yet the nature of the problems and their solution seem to call for this procedure throughout the study. There were moments when I felt that Mr. Martz's scholarship imposed upon my human frailty, which in its weakness would have excused that second quotation, however illuminating. Occasionally the reader is left wondering where he is to find the antecedent of a demonstrative pronoun or where he tripped in the course of a difficult transition. If these be faults, they in no way detract from the value of the work.

It is a virtue of the book that the passages dealing with a specific poet are, on the whole, quite self-contained and meaningful, although the exposition of the opening chapter is assumed to a greater or lesser degree throughout. Certainly the chapters of Part II can be read independently, which is not to say that the study lacks unity, but the unity is that of approach and will allow the parts to stand in a relationship of considerable independence. It should be pointed out here that Mr. Martz does

not exclude any number of other approaches to these same poets, although it seems inevitable now that any approach to the poems in the future will take for granted the character of this poetry as meditation.

The book is atttractively printed and handsomely bound. The frontispiece is Georges de la Tour's "Madeleine au Miroir," an admirable study in meditation.

PERRY J. POWERS

University of Oregon

LEICESTER, PATRON OF LETTERS. By Eleanor Rosenberg, New York: Columbia University Press, 1955. xx, 395 p.; 2 plates.

Because she wisely decided to furnish her readers with a full account of all of Leicester's activities instead of following the usual custom of limiting her study to the noble Lord's gratuities to men of letters, Miss Rosenberg has written the best book on early patronage that I have seen. The customary practice would have left us here, as it has in other studies, with the impression that the old aristocracy was very careful with its money and favors. Miss Rosenberg, to the contrary, provides us with the portrait of a man who compensated for his roughness of character and egocentricities with a wise generousness to the talented and learned.

It is sensibly observed in the beginning that patronage was a political expedient, and that Elizabeth made a specialty of avoiding the narrowness of royal favor—and also cherished her natural frugality—by delegating it to the great nobles. Thanks, then, to the royally encouraged open-handedness of Leicester, Burghley, Hatton, Essex, and others, the learning and culture of England, not yet much valued by the continentals, was enhanced and entered as a strong competitor to that of the rest of the world. I approve most wholeheartedly Miss Rosenberg's excursion, in her early chapters, on the so-called servility and fulsomeness of Elizabethan prefaces. Professors, whose own prefaces are likely to contain similar remarks about the right people, have found them particularly offensive. The practice resulted, Miss Rosenberg thinks, from the rhetorical tradition and was expected. I also imagine that it has something to do with the Renaissance attitude toward the emotions. Men loved and hated in that period; indifference and detachment were still to be discovered.

The strong thesis of this book is the statement that the beneficiaries of patronage "were not entertainers but serious writers of utilitarian works, descendants of the medieval scholar rather than of the minstrel." This observation, so obvious on its surface, guides the author through this most revealing essay, and produces a kind of intellectual biography of the patron as well. In his youth, Leicester was most interested in bringing the English up to the intellectual level of those peoples whom they had defeated in arms since the reign of Edward III. To this end, Englishmen must have "knowledge of the expanding world, methodological information in all fields, inspiration and guidance." Books providing these requirements were not to be had to any great extent in pre-Elizabethan England, so continental and classical works had first to be transplanted, adapted, and compiled so that the Briton might forge his own cultural tools. It is not surprising that, as Leicester's patronage became known, continental scholars and theorists began to seek his favor, too. The European tradition of the rich English "milord" may well begin with Dudley.

The first book sponsored by the Earl was probably *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subiectes* (perhaps composed by Spenser's Aylmer), an attack on Knox's *First Blast* and a rebuke to those Englishmen who wanted a state church on the Genevan model. It was a book that, at one and the same time, informed the

average Englishman, refuted Calvinistic policies, and supported the Queen's stand. Books of an informative nature followed: Cuningham on cosmology, Blundeville on horses, others on medicine, history, and philosophy. Having provided us with a chronological list of the books dedicated to Leicester in her appendix, Miss Rosenberg treats his clients in large sections. Since a knowledge of history and historical research was essential to the strengthening of England's position in the world, Leicester stood behind the historians and the methodologists. As Chancellor of Oxford and a friend of Cambridge, he pushed the projects of scholars at both universities. He was especially kind to translators: Robert Fills, William Fulwood, Arthur Golding, John Shute, Thomas Danett, Thomas Nuce, Thomas North, William Malim, James Sanforde, William Blandie, Robert Peterson, Timothe Kendall, Thomas Stocker, and Christopher Fetherstone translated from French, Spanish, Italian, and Latin at his Lordship's suggestion. He was equally generous to controversalists, provided that they supported the Puritan position and vigorously attacked Rome. Altogether, almost a hundred books were printed as a result of his patronage. Only Simon Guggenheim can outclass him.

In a last chapter, Miss Rosenberg takes up the problems of three men who sought Leicester's continued patronage and failed. Harvey, she contends, lacked sincerity and made an ass of himself in the presence of Leicester and the Queen. The more difficult problem of Spenser's relations to Leicester bothers Miss Rosenberg, as it had most of us; however, she wisely observes that the notion that Spenser was cast off is a creation of a certain school of scholarship rather than a proper interpretation of the facts. There is no evidence that the breach between the two men was serious, or that Spenser harbored resentment. The case of John Florio is similar to Spenser's.

In developing each section of her study, Miss Rosenberg tells us something about the career of each author, of the nature of his dedication and of the book it prefaced, and of the importance of the book to the historical scene. In other words, the whole is created from the parts, and the dull, annotated bibliographies that characterize so many exercises of this nature are eschewed. To those interested in patronage and in the intellectual movements of Elizabethan England, this book will be most helpful.

D. C. Allen

John Hopkins University

The Development of American Literary Criticism. Essays by Harry H. Clark, Richard H. Fogle, Robert P. Falk, John H. Raleigh, C. Hugh Holman. Edited with an Introduction by Floyd Stovall. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955. ix, 262 p.

A book born out of six separate essays is something of a Saturday's child. Professor Stovall expresses hope, first, that, while the essays are not offered as a complete history of American criticism, "they will serve usefully the needs of advanced students of American literary criticism until a complete history shall be provided"; and, second, that the authors "have succeeded in giving the book enough unity to constitute it in effect a single work"—to which we might add the remark on the dust jacket that "until now little attempt has been made by literary scholars to analyze and evaluate this large body of critical writing." The first hope is partly fulfilled; the limitation is the degree to which the second is not.

Clearly a general history of the subject is needed. The question is, however, on what basis a history or even a preliminary survey can be written, for both analysis and evaluation are needed. The difficulty with this volume is indicated in three

remarks by different essayists: "I have tried to subordinate my personal attitudes to an objective exposition of the logical articulation of critical ideas [of the period 1800-1840]" (Harry H. Clark); "the central history of American criticism from 1900 to 1930 is largely the history of the development of these conflicting forces, and the significance of that period lies in the final meaning of the conflict" (John H. Raleigh); "none of us can make a record of criticism during the last twenty-five years except as a combatant or as an injured bystander" (C. Hugh Holman). What Professor Clark feels possible in the remoter regions of the early nineteenth century is obviously less possible in the twentieth; yet one may well think his "objectivity" as much a chimera as Professor Raleigh's "final meaning," or the verdict of any mere "bystander" in the present. To write the history of a war is a subtle guerrilla operation; one always has a point of view. The value of a survey or a history is the value of what the view reveals, of the analyses and evaluations.

History of ideas in America seems inevitably to involve another more or less explicitly formulated concept of "America," another self-searching in the mirror of the past, another effort to synthesize; and the history of literary criticism is no exception. The title and the division into periods of this volume are themselves implicit comments on the subject matter. As Professor Stovall says in his Introduction, they suggest that there is something specifically American about American criticism, and that its nature is, partly at least, the result of absorbing native materials. But they also suggest more: that it is a direct reflection of social and, to some extent, literary history, and that it has a *development*. There are points of view from which these suggestions seem less important, and this question—of the nature and scope of the subject—is itself an issue. Thus, we may well argue that literary criticism is a branch of literary history; that the historian looks primarily at the relation between artist and public, and treats the critic as a mediator between them. If he does, he may well give more attention to Whitman and Poe than to Emerson, more to Huneker than to Brownell, and a great deal to James and Eliot.

But is not literary criticism a branch of social and cultural history? Ought not the historian to treat literary criticism as fundamentally cultural history—to show how the second-rate critics illustrate the dominant mood of a period? Or is criticism a branch of philosophy in the wider sense? Are basic concepts, categories, "isms," the real actors, and history the dialectic of ideas? Are not Emerson and John Crowe Ransom engaged in some kind of perennial debate? Or is criticism an art in its own right, perhaps, expressing the responses of an "ideal reader" to particular works of art, subtly and significantly discriminated and evaluated? If so, then out go the prophets and profiteers who debase the art, out go the mere theorists, out goes almost everyone until we come to the moderns—among whom it is unnecessary to name names.

But, of course, literary criticism is all these things, and more. The limitation of this volume of essays is that the focus is not so much synoptic as uncertain. In the main the prevailing directions are those suggested in the Introduction—towards social, cultural, and literary history, rather than towards the philosophical or aesthetic analysis of criticism. These directions are not prevailing enough, however; the book lacks the strength that (to take a convenient example) Foerster's *American Criticism*, with all its limitations, still possesses.

Professor Clark sets out, in his essay on "Changing Attitudes in Early American Literary Criticism, 1800-1840," to make a "logical articulation" of critical ideas based on "changing attitudes towards certain basic concepts and methods." The result is a highly formal treatment, under such headings as "The Turn from Understanding to Intuitive Reason and Imagination," "From Moralism to Beauty," etc. As one reads, the word "logical" raises some doubts. For one thing, Professor

Clark does not—and cannot by his approach—show how the ideas he discusses cohered together; he assumes that that is known. But his method itself does not provide much illumination. It is never quite clear, for example, whether he is assuming that the categories he uses are quite valid ("understanding" vs. "intuitive reason") and is simply cataloguing examples of preferences for one or the other, or whether he is describing a change in the nature of philosophical and aesthetic analysis, or a mere shift of usage, or a development of insight, or what. Under "beauty," so vague is his term, he lists hedonism (Irving), "critical hedonism" (Poe); "beauty as a by-product of social justice" (Lowell); "ethical beauty" (Longfellow); and varieties of transcendental beauty (Hawthorne, Emerson). When, later in the essay, he analyzes his terms more fully, they become more significant. Nevertheless, the essay as a whole is somewhat disappointing. If it treats criticism as a branch of philosophy, it does little more with the material than provide a useful but rough index of names.

Even though the next essayist, Professor Fogle, "Organic Form in American Criticism, 1840-70," also treats criticism philosophically, there is now a sharp change of focus. This essay is much more crisply written and organized. Professor Fogle takes earlier work on the period (Foerster and Matthiessen, for example) for granted in concentrating on a critical analysis of the central concept of "organic form." He is thus able to relate criticism to creative achievement, to give due weight to the major figures, and above all to make some suggestive comparisons with modern critical theories.

Professor Falk tries to do more in discussing "The Literary Criticism of the Genteel Decades, 1870-1900"—to strike a balance between the analysis of dominant social attitudes (rather loosely related to creative achievements) and the analysis of a central concept, realism. His aim is to relate the two, to show how, under social pressures and the rise of the novel as a literary form, the earlier union of realism and "romance," of actual and ideal, fact and imagination, broke. Yet the weakness of the volume is exhibited here again. Within his necessary limits, he cannot do more than suggest the implications of the dilemmas that appeared at the time and suggest a sympathetic approach to the "Victorian compromise"; he cannot provide the further analysis and criticism to show how far the dilemmas go—the point, of course, of Trilling's *Liberal Imagination* and one of Foerster's main themes. The essay needs the supplement of Professor Fogle's method. As it is, the significant correlating is left to the reader.

Professor Raleigh, in "Revolt and Revaluation in Criticism, 1900-1930," looks at criticism from yet another angle. Abandoning the usual analysis of the period into a procession or conflict of "isms," he looks for broad cultural movements: creativity and idealism up to 1917, the sharply corrective attitude to native culture dominant in the 1920s, and the internationalism and technical interests of the early Eliot and Pound. The result is a perceptively critical essay on American culture, pointing out how all these movements were united in attempting a synthesis of cultures, a society and aspiration for the future. On the other hand, Professor Raleigh is hardly concerned with the specifically literary ideas of the time; he must, in short, assume knowledge of the "isms" in order to make his sketch map of cultural forces.

And finally, with Professor Holman's "The Defense of Art, since 1930," where history passes over completely to analysis, the focus is changed once more. Criticism is now treated as evaluation of literary works made by means of "provisional frames of reference." In the face of competing "frames of reference," he looks to what is indeed the central theme of modern criticism, the defense of art, "noting the movements without attempting a serious evaluation of them." This intention itself is hardly satisfying, and one wonders what subtle point is being made when

he adds, "I suspect that Philip Wheelwright is correct when he calls the 'three elements of contemporary criticism—the anthropological, the psychological, and the semantic,' but certainly the sociological and the historical need to be added if we are attempting a record rather than an evaluation" (pp. 200-201). Does he mean to suggest that, unlike the others, the sociological and historical are what he calls merely "immediately significant responses to the pressures of their age?" If he criticizes Marxism (fairly enough) as "strangely empty of achievement" either in literary theory or practice, what of the people he lists as socially or historically orientated but not specifically Marxists? Matthiessen, Wilson, Levin, Trilling are duly praised for having emphasized the relevance of literature to life—"a relevance within which at least one of its principal virtues may be found" (p. 213). Even the Marxists, we are told, enriched criticism by their "intense preoccupation with literature as a life-force" (p. 210). Clearly, in all this uncertainty there is room, not only for "more serious criticism," but perhaps even more for some clarification of what evaluation involves.

What seems to disturb the whole essay, in fact, is a confusion of two quite separate distinctions to be made about modern criticism. Professor Holman bases his analysis upon a distinction between two major groups of critics who would defend literature: "those who tend to make a synthetic approach, finding the chief value of literature in its extrinsic relation to society and civilization, and those who tend to make an analytic approach, expecting thereby to demonstrate the intrinsic value of literature. Certainly few critics—and one is tempted to add, no good ones—use one approach exclusively" (p. 204). This forms the basis of his sections on "Extrinsic Criticism — Marxist" and "Non-Marxist," and on "The New Critics," who have been concerned to discover "the intrinsic value of literature" (p. 226), insisting that "the morality and value of a work of art is a function of its inner qualities and that literature cannot be evaluated in general terms not directly related to the work itself" (p. 227). The word "intrinsic" is the most questionable. At first sight it seems a reasonable enough distinction between those who have been interested in making explicit evaluations of literature, often very crudely, and those who have been mainly concerned with analysis and interpretation and have left explicit evaluation more or less to look after itself. This is a clear enough distinction; but its limitations are apparent when we consider the work of such men as Matthiessen and Trilling, or when we ask whether it is possible to conceive literary value as "intrinsic" at all. For the distinction between two different emphases in critical writing is not necessarily a distinction between two different conceptions of literary value, as these critics, who combine both explicit evaluation and an analytic method, demonstrate. And evaluation, whatever else it implies, implies a context, a reference to something other than the work of art—so that by "intrinsic value" Professor Holman perhaps means little more than the particular value of the specific work under consideration.

However, there is, I believe, another distinction that he has confused with the simple one between the main emphasis in a critic's writings—viz., between those who believe that art is continuous with reality or nature and those who do not. The modern attack on the organic theories of the romantics (as in Professor Fogle's essay) has been directed to showing how they cause the work of art to lose its specific character as a work of art, to lose its specific weight, as it becomes a representation or symbol, an extension, of nature. Instead of valuing the organic work of art for the same reasons as the romantics did—because it is continuous with, and so revealing of, an organic nature—some modern critics seem to value the organic work because it imposes a kind of value upon a cold, chaotic, unmeaningful, unhuman nature, because, precisely, it is discontinuous with nature. It is perhaps partly for this reason that contemporary critical attention has turned

away from the transcendentalists towards Poe and James, away from a free and imaginative abandonment towards the investigation of the complexities of art, of the degree to which the work organizes experience, and of the levels of its meaning and their interaction in metaphor and symbol. This distinction is perhaps what Professor Holman points to with his words "extrinsic" and "intrinsic." But if so, the fact that different kinds of value are found in art does not mean that a work can be evaluated in isolation from the rest of experience; nor does it mean that the best critics will necessarily use both "approaches"; nor does it encourage us to distinguish between, let us say, Trilling as "extrinsic" and Yvor Winters as "intrinsic." It is when we examine Professor Holman's practical divisions that his distinction seems most unhelpful; it seems significant that in his scheme "Psychological Criticism" is not labelled "extrinsic" or "intrinsic" at all.

In many ways, Professor Holman has the most difficult subject of all, and perhaps the Proteus which is contemporary American criticism is beyond the grasp of any essay. The real difficulty in this essay is that of the book as whole—the uncertainty of focus and lack of integration that derive from trying to do too many things at once. Individually, all these essays are valuable, but valuable for different reasons in each case. The result is extremely suggestive for the general history we hope to see, and in the meantime suggestive, if not completely satisfying, for the "advanced student" to whom it is addressed.

One rather unexpected lesson emerges for a non-American. The lack of a long native tradition, the detachment once possible in a "province," the intense and continual concern for the individual, seem to have made American criticism sharper and more serious in a sense than much English criticism. Further, they have made it possible to trace in American criticism the implications of romantic and postromantic thought in a rather purer form. If American criticism has at times been extremist and eccentric, it has also very often dealt with fundamental issues. In a country where so much history has happened in so short a time, where so many aspirations meet each other and the facts of modern life, criticism is necessarily more urgent. It is one merit of this book of essays that it demonstrates this fact.

S. L. Goldberg

University of Melbourne

Transatlantic Migration. The Contemporary American Novel in France. By Thelma M. Smith and Ward L. Miner. Durham: Duke University Press, 1955. 264 p.

In this volume the authors set out to "see what has happened to the contemporary American novel in France." As students of American literature rather than of French, they have chosen to concentrate their research not on specific influences but on the nature and extent of the vogue which a select group of American novelists have enjoyed during the past three decades. Within these limits they have produced a work which will be particularly useful to literary historians and to comparatists. Although the study follows main lines that are well known, the authors have performed a valuable service by charting these lines with an exactitude made possible only by the careful sorting of a vast amount of factual material.

The early chapters deal in general terms with the "trans-Atlantic migration" of the American novel. The account begins with the rapid-fire translation of twenty of Jack London's books during the decade following World War I, and comes down to the assembly-line production of detective novels translated (actually or alleg-

edly) from the American, and finally to the various reactions against this Yankee invasion. Novelists brought into the discussion range from London and Dreiser to Raymond Chandler and Mickey Spillane, but the major stresses fall upon Dos Passos, Hemingway, Faulkner, Caldwell, and Steinbeck—*les cinq grands*. For the French critics and serious readers, the contemporary American novel means primarily the works of these five men, each of whom writes in the *style américain*.

What is this style? Any attempt to define it briefly may bewilder the American reader. Professors Smith and Miner approach the problem by presenting a French view of America. "America was described as young, raw, crude; France as old, mature, civilized. American literature was new and in its epic stage." The writers, Malraux has told his countrymen, are not intellectuals. They lack both the "relative historical culture" and the "love of ideas" which characterize their European counterparts. Or at any rate, so far as French opinion is concerned, the American writers who do possess these characteristics—for example, Thornton Wilder or Frederick Prokosch—should be classed as European rather than American. Fiction in the *style américain* is vigorous and nonanalytical, though pessimistic; as such it contrasts sharply with the hyperanalytical French novels of individualism. American fiction is the modern counterpart of Greek tragedy; the protagonists are ground to dust by an impersonal power which they cannot challenge. The *reportage* of their tragedy is characterized by realistic detail; nevertheless, this *style américain* is not mere naturalism. It is marked by a poetry and a human sympathy which lead French critics to speak of romanticism. But both terms are inadequate, for the aesthetic values of the American novelists are the same as those of the Greeks. "It is in this judgment that the French show how profoundly they have been moved by the contemporary American novel."

First the French intellectuals discovered Dos Passos, who has remained for them a "writer's writer." Then came Hemingway, Faulkner, Caldwell, and Steinbeck, all four of whom have achieved both critical and popular success. Perhaps the central fact in this study of *les cinq grands* is the apotheosis of William Faulkner by the French literary elite. Faulkner is "a literary miracle," "the greatest living novelist," a creator to be ranked with Dostoevsky and Proust. Poet, puritan, and pessimist in the French view, Faulkner seems to have in exactly the right proportions the qualities that appeal most strongly to the postwar intellectuals.

The vogue of five authors, then, has shaped the French conception of the contemporary American novel. How has this important literary phenomenon affected the French view of the United States in general? It has had little effect if we may judge by the present volume. Professors Smith and Miner show us certain constants in the criticism of *les cinq grands*. Americans are immature, nomadic (*dépaysés*), puritan in several senses of that abused word, uncultured, and materialistic. But these adjectives were constants in French opinion long before the advent of the authors under discussion. This view of America dates back not merely to Baudelaire, as the authors suggest, but to Stendhal and Balzac. For more than a hundred years the United States has been for many Frenchmen a land of crass materialism and intellectual immaturity. The fictional world of our five authors could hardly be expected to cause a drastic revision of this old and persistent picture. It is too early, however, to predict final results, either literary or nonliterary, of the vogue; and *Transatlantic Migration* makes no attempt to do so.

Even though the book fulfills its stated purpose, one may regret certain omissions. To avoid leading the reader into an error in perspective, it might have been emphasized that novelists are by no means the only American writers who have enjoyed a vogue in France. In the prefatory remarks playwrights O'Neill, Wilder, Tennessee Williams, and Arthur Miller are dismissed too succinctly. "With relief"

the authors say nothing of poets and poetry. T. S. Eliot, even though he is well known to the French as both poet and playwright, goes without mention.

Little in this book suggests that the contemporary American novel should be considered as anything but a purely indigenous product. That French techniques of fiction played a part, directly in some cases, indirectly in others, in the development of *les cinq grands*—this fact of major importance receives scarcely any notice.

Despite such limitations, *Transatlantic Migration* represents careful scholarship and judicious writing in a field where the models are few. It sets clearly before us an example of one national literature impinging upon another, and provides a sound basis for further and more detailed study.

GEORGE REEVES, JR.

University of South Carolina

THE REDISCOVERY OF SIR JOHN MANDEVILLE. By Josephine Waters Bennett. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1954. 436 p.

All students of the Middle Ages will take great pleasure in reading Mrs. Bennett's *Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville*. They will find that she accomplishes beyond their expectation what she set out to do, "to clear away the debris of misinformation and misunderstanding which has accumulated around both the [*Travels*] and its author for six centuries" (p. 11); and they will admire her resolute attempt, in the face of the absence of all records, to give the hero of the *Travels* a character so real that he can be more easily (p. 5) accepted as an actual, living person rather than as a fiction. If they agree with her that the hero of the *Travels* is what she believes him to be, a real man with a distinct personality, then they will accept without much questioning her reconstruction of his biography, her estimate of his character, and her interpretation of his book. If, on the contrary, they disagree with her, they will apply her major conclusions to the fictitious hero of the *Travels*, the artistic creation of some anonymous author. In either case, a Sir John Mandeville has been "rediscovered."

Mrs. Bennett's reconsideration of the *Travels* is based on the solid foundation of a study of the manuscripts, the first complete study ever made. With an acumen that arouses admiration, she comes to conclusions about their relationships that seem irrefutable. She finds that the French manuscripts (about sixty of them) fall into three groups: (1) the Norman French, (2) the French of Paris, and (3) the "Ogier," so called from references in it to Ogier the Dane. By comparing these three versions, she has been able to show that the Norman French is probably the original text and is the basis for the best English version; that the French of Paris is a redaction of the Norman French; and that the "Ogier" is a redaction of the French of Paris, and is the basis for the Latin vulgate and the German version by Otto von Diemeringen, which in turn is the basis of the Czech and Danish versions.

The key to this arrangement of the manuscripts is a manuscript that Mrs. Bennett discovered in Chantilly (Musée Condé No. 699, formerly 1414), which preserves more fully than the Brussels manuscript (No. 10,420-5), known to Hamelius and Letts, or any others that she has found, the Ogier redaction of the Paris text. This manuscript, written in a northern French dialect close to that of Liège, contains the Ogier interpolations and the autobiographical passages that connect Mandeville with the city of Liège, all of which are in the Latin vulgate. It gives also four additional "works" to Mandeville—an account of the earth, a description of the heavens, a herbal, and a lapidary. It alone among the manuscripts of the group actually records these "works," though the others give

evidence that behind them is the conception of a five-book Mandeville. There seems to be little reason to doubt the soundness of Mrs. Bennett's conclusion, that the Latin vulgate is but an abbreviated version of the Ogier version of the Paris French. The relationship between these two versions is of importance for her reconsideration of the Mandeville biography, which has always been especially troublesome.

There are two traditions that connect Mandeville with the city of Liège. One states that he was Jean de Bourgogne, called *à la Barbe*, an eminent physician; the other, that he was an acquaintance of Jean de Bourgogne, at whose suggestion, while being treated for an illness on his way home, he wrote the *Travels*. The first of these rests upon the famous epitaph and a passage in Jean d'Outremeuse's *Ly Myreur des Histors*; the second on certain autobiographical passages that belong only to the Ogier version and those texts that are derived from it. There is considerable evidence, which Mrs. Bennett presents with telling effect, to show that in some way Jean d'Outremeuse, who, as Letts puts it, "haunts the Mandeville student like a spectre," was accountable for both of these traditions. It was he who inserted into the Paris version the Ogier interpolations and the autobiographical passage that connect Mandeville with Liège and Jean de Bourgogne. It was he who later made up the story, which he gives in his *Myreur*, that Mandeville was Jean de Bourgogne; and it was he who very probably forged the epitaph to support it. Mrs. Bennett sums up as follows:

"In the end we have nothing but the story of a thoroughly discredited witness to connect the author of the *Travels* with the Liège doctor—or with Liège at all. On the contrary, a survey of the French texts shows that the oldest version is the one in Norman French which, so far as we can tell, was unknown in Liège, where the Paris redaction was used to make the Ogier version. We have, therefore, good reason to believe that the work originated elsewhere, and that it had been circulating for some time, probably as much as fifteen or twenty years, before a copy came into the hands of Jean d'Outremeuse. In all probability the famous Liège doctor, Jean de Bourgogne, or *à la Barbe*, who died in 1372, had never even heard of it" (pp. 168-169).[1]

Thus, Sir John Mandeville (whether author or hero) was Jean d'Outremeuse's gift to the city of Liège.

In order to support the conclusions that she draws from her study of the manuscripts, Mrs. Bennett uses the character of Mandeville as it emerges from the *Travels*. Since this portrait is to be considered one of the major contributions of her book, I present it in some detail.

"Mandeville is [she says] a modest, reasonable, and tolerant man, the man of culture and wide reading... full of reverence for the God who made all things, secure in a firm faith, yet free from intolerance and narrow orthodoxy. He is gentle and charitable towards the strange beliefs of the heathen, and even toward the 'heretics,' i.e., the Greeks, Nestorians, and other non-Roman Christian sects of whom he writes. He treats all that he reports with the respect due to God's handiwork, and the humility of a modest observer who does not pretend to understand the ways of God. He is fond of quoting Scripture (in the Latin of the Vulgate), and has amazed even his detractors by the extent and variety of his reading. He has a sense of humor not unlike Chaucer's. He makes use of the sly juxtaposition of details, so as to suggest a comment on human foibles without actually making one and so passing from humor to satire. He has the 'gentilesse' which is the core of Chaucer's urbanity, the wholesomeness which is the flower

[1] Since Hamelius's attempt to identify Mandeville and Jean d'Outremeuse has never been taken very seriously, I pass over Mrs. Bennett's admirable refutations of all his arguments.

of a well-balanced personality, and the kindliness which puts understanding before judgment. He has the sympathetic imagination to credit remote people dwelling on the other side of the earth with the feelings, desires, and human failings which he had observed at home..." (p. 5).

He is "a modest and candid observer," who is interested in all things. He surrounds the places that he describes with literary and historical associations, but he sees them always inhabited, for his center of interest is always human nature. Even the miracles that he delights in take their meaning from their being contrary to kind. Such a man is not a "mere plagiarist," or a "mere translator," as he has been called, but a writer of great merit, who was able to stamp his personality on his work. He was not a mere pilferer from Odoric, Vincent of Beauvais, and others, but an author who used materials, transforming them with artistry to his purpose. He was not a dishonest perpetrator of absurdities, but the creator of a "romance of travel." He was in short a writer with a distinct personality and a distinct style. The character that Mrs. Bennett here draws is of importance to her contention that the author of the *Travels* is so real that he can be more easily believed to have existed than to have been a fiction.

With this portrait in mind, she approaches the manuscripts again and uses Mandeville's personality as a touchstone to test their authenticity. She finds that the Ogier interpolations are the result of a different type of mind. It would not be the way of the writer of the *Travels* to destroy the factual tone of his narrative by inserting the fantastic Ogier interpolations, nor the way of Jean de Bourgogne, who wrote learned medical treatises in Latin; but it might be and, from what we know of him, probably was the way of the romancer, Jean d'Outremeuse, who shows in his *Myreur* a predilection for Ogier the Dane. She finds also that the Norman French text with its compact, vigorous, concrete style reflects Mandeville's personality more accurately than the Paris text or its derivative Ogier version, both of which are diffuse and dull by comparison and seem clearly to be the result of a desire to turn the Norman French word order into idiomatic French. The English text, which comes from the Norman French, represents well the mind of Mandeville.

The character of Mandeville, which she has so skillfully built up out of the *Travels*, is so vivid to Mrs. Bennett that she cannot believe it to be a fiction. And so she turns, as others have before her, to the Mandeville family in the hope of finding a real Sir John Mandeville who could have been the author. Here, alas, in spite of exhaustive researches, she meets with failure. Among the many John Mandevilles on record she cannot point out *the* Sir John Mandeville. It is a pity that her "rediscovery" could not have been complete.

As it is, her judgment of Mandeville must remain almost entirely subjective. She faces a problem that every student of the Middle Ages faces in the judgment of mediaeval writers, namely, the conformity of the individual to a preconceived type, the spontaneous expression to the literary formula. The character of Mandeville as it emerges out of the *Travels* is too much what one might expect of a mediaeval traveler not to suggest that there is at least to some degree a fiction involved. His piety, his interest in manners and languages, his historical, literary, and traditional allusions, and above all his fascination with mirabilia—all are typical rather than individual. Mandeville is somewhat like Giraldus Cambrensis, but he is lacking in the egotism and critical observations that make Giraldus seem real. Even those things which his critics hold against him, as Mrs. Bennett points out, are not particular to him. His pose of the eye witness is not more censurable than the same pose in other authors of the Middle Ages, who tell stories as absurd as his. His attitude towards miracles does not set him apart; it was general in the Middle Ages. "If," says Giraldus, "a scrupulous inquirer

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED LIBRARY AUG 18 1956

should ask my opinion of the relation here inserted, I answer with Augustin, 'that the divine miracles are to be admired, not discussed' " (*Itinerary*, Everyman ed., p. 20). And yet, even if a fiction is admitted in whole or in part, Mrs. Bennett is justified in using the personality of the hero of the *Travels* as a test to build up her case against Jean d'Outremeuse and to strengthen her argument for the priority of the Anglo-Norman text. For my own part, I cannot believe wholeheartedly, without some record, in the existence of Sir John Mandeville.

The study of the manuscripts and the establishment of Mandeville's character discussed above take up two closely knit parts of Mrs. Bennett's book. To make her work complete she adds a third part on the reputation and influence of the *Travels*, and shows how Mandeville belongs not "to the history of exploration . . . but to the history of European literature" (p. 9). Some 250 manuscripts and 158 editions, all of which are listed with full descriptions in her appendices, attest to the popularity of the *Travels*. There has never been a period of many years that it has lain neglected, and it has always revived to stir men's imagination anew. For the first two hundred years it held an eminent place as a travel book, doing its part in the "imaginative preparation" that led to the desire to find a route to the Indies and the Far East, and since then it has been a "bright imaginary world" of its own that has had a fascination for both young and old.

Mrs. Bennett is to be commended for her scholarly and cautious treatment of the influence of the *Travels*. She has recognized, as too often has not been done, the danger of allotting to Mandeville the credit for what is in reality a commonplace that he has used with effect. Since he was so popular, he may have been the immediate stimulus that brought about in later writers a revivification, but without the best of evidence we can never be sure. To take an example, Mandeville put his Garden of the Assassins on an island on top of a mountain. Tasso placed his Garden of Armida in the same situation. He "could have found," as Mrs. Bennett says (p. 249), these details in Mandeville, but he could have found them also in many other places—in Claudian, in Petrarch, in Politian. The truth seems to be that all these writers are using a commonplace with a long tradition. (See under *locus amoenus*, E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, and the Leonid Arbusow, *Colores Rhetorici*). Since Mandeville's originality lies in his treatment of his materials rather than in the materials themselves, any direct influence of his is difficult to substantiate. Mrs. Bennett herself runs into this difficulty when she attempts to show an influence of the *Travels* upon Chaucer.

This book is an important one. It brings together all that is known about Sir John Mandeville and his famous travel book. It makes clear for the first time the relations between the various texts and throws a new light upon the speculations of the scholars who have attempted a Mandeville biography. It is admirably conceived, and persuasively written. It will be for some time to come the starting point for all future work on Mandeville or the *Travels*.

PHILIP W. SOUERS

University of Oregon

THE CONTEMPORARY FRENCH NOVEL. By Henri Peyre. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. xvi, 363 p.

This is a book written, as its author states (p. 4), "by a Frenchman specifically for the enlightened American public in and outside the Universities," and it is blessedly remote from the abstruse technical jargon that characterizes much modern literary analysis. Based upon the Mary Flexner Lectures given by the author at Bryn Mawr College in 1944, it has been enlarged to permit of a certain con-

spectus of the movement of ideas in modern literature in the ten years following World War II. It sets itself a limited objective—the most significant developments in the French novel from 1930 to 1954, with a discerning and eclectic prelude covering the period 1919 to 1930—and its breadth and sanity, and its courage in attempting a short-range synthesis of such a Protean genre as the novel, will win its learned author much commendation as well as sympathy.

Broadly, Professor Peyre takes the view that the French novel had exhausted, from Madame de La Fayette to Proust, the utmost possibilities of the *roman d'analyse*, and that its renewal came at the hands of men who "aimed at capturing the mysteries of man in action" (p. 273). In this development, of course, and notably after 1941, the American novel played a decisive part; and a Frenchman deeply versed in European literature, and on the faculty of a great American university, was most strategically placed for tracing its history. Professor Peyre has preserved an admirable equilibrium in interpreting the French novel to Americans and the American novel (this book will surely be widely read in France) to the French. His chapter on "The Impact of the American Novel" is a brilliant and succinct piece of comparative literary criticism.

Reputations, of course, go tumbling like ninepins. The author pulls no punches; and in achieving a triumphantly simple synthesis he has no hesitation in consigning to limbo both established and bubble reputations. Colette is dismissed (p. 283) as "almost prehistoric," Serge Groussard (p. 318) as "hollow, conventional, and completely undistinguished," and Céline and Bernanos (p. 280) as "two visionary giants with clay feet, addicted to orgies of words." Morand, Maurois, Chardonne, Carco, and Schlumberger are demolished scornfully in two lines (p. 38), André Chamson gets the merest mention, Joseph Peyré hardly even that, Paul Vialar receives half a line (p. 36), La Varende nothing at all. Jules Romains (though he receives his meed of praise) is unflatteringly likened to a pharmacist or grocer (p. 60), and Gide, unimaginative (p. 86) and "not a powerful thinker" (p. 87), finds himself reduced as a novelist to three books only. Giraudoux's novels are passed over (p. 38) on the plea that he is "primarily a dramatist." Raymond Radiguet, on the other hand, receives four pages of warm commendation (pp. 62-65) and a reference to Alain-Fournier (p. 38) is, tantalizingly enough, not followed up.

The significant novelists of the 1930-54 period are reduced to five—Mauriac, Giono, Saint-Exupéry, Malraux, and Sartre, with Camus and Simone de Beauvoir in support. Giono and Malraux are the two on whom Professor Peyre dwells at greatest length, and with a sympathetic, humanist emphasis, though it is in his chapter on Sartre that (perhaps in reaction against detractors) he permits himself the warmest partisanship and superlatives. In classifying the existentialist chief as a "superb intelligence, one of the broadest since Goethe and Renan" (p. 233), and his novel *La Nausée* as "one of the masterpieces of the twentieth century" (p. 225), he is taking the courageous and difficult step of passing definitive judgment on a most prolific writer still in mid-career. It is quite a "transvaluation," too, to devote thirty-three pages to a Giono on whom earlier manuals like those of Clouard and Lalou spared a grudging two—and this, with only brief reference to the post-1945 Giono. Such new perspectives are refreshing.

A very valuable "Panorama of Present-Day Novelists" (comprising brief but telling notes on ninety-three novelists of the post-1945 period), a list of novels already translated into English, and a selected bibliography of "essential general works on the novel," round off a volume whose scholarship, humanity, and breadth make it a most notable contribution to criticism and an indispensable work of reference.

R. T. Sussex

Christchurch University College, New Zealand

THREE ELEGIES OF QUINTILIUS. By Peter Russell. Tunbridge Wells: The Pound Press, 1954. 28 p.

This little book (a fourth elegy has been mimeographed and included), by Peter Russell, is an interesting addition to literature. The poems are said to be translations from the work of a still unknown Latin poet of the fourth century. Mr. Russell, no doubt correctly, gives his dates as A.D. 397-427.

Before the elegies is printed as an introduction a little Latin poem, or compilation, the object of which is no doubt to secure a permanently classical background to what follows. For it is a cento of much Ovid and a little Catullus, as follows:

> "How many kissings
> are enough and more for me?"
> (Cat., 7, 1-2)

> "The elm loves vines, vines abandon not the elm;
> Why am I so oft separated from the mistress of my heart?"
> (Ov., *Am.* II, 16, 41-3)

> "What boot your sacrifices? What now avail the sistrums
> of Egypt? What your repose apart in faithful beds?"
> (*Ibid.*, III, 9, 33-4)

> "Applaud thy Mars, O soldier! Arms I detest; peace is my
> delight, and love that is found in the midst of peace."
> (*Ibid.*, III, 2, 49-50)

> "What are you doing, wretch? You will lose my girl
> the prayer of her heart."
> (*Ibid.*, III, 2, 71)

> "Be wrathful if you will, 'tis forbidden joys delight;
> she only charms whoe'er can say: "I fear!" "
> (*Ibid.*, III, 4, 31-2)

> "And does anyone still respect the freeborn arts,
> or deem tender verse brings any dower?"
> (*Ibid.*, III, 8, 1-2)

> "And yet more by night than in the light of day—Night is
> welcome to women beneath whose neck an embracing arm is
> placed."

> "I, in my widowed couch, can only court a sleep with lying
> dreams; while true joys fail me, false ones must delight."
> (Ov., *Heroid.*, 13, 105-8)

It is unfortunate that the translator has not hastened his promised publication of the original palimpsist, so that the reader may compare versions and see for himself how well the task has been accomplished. But as luck would have it, for the past few years, the reviewer has been reading manuscripts of the sixth-century poet Maximianus, and others. In the process of working through these, he has had the good fortune to come upon a florilegium which contains a few fragments of Quintilius.

It is not the present intention to anticipate Mr. Russell's publication of the Latin elegies or to eclipse the lustre which will result from such an edition. The curious

reader, however, who may desire to pass judgment upon the translation, is entitled to glimpse a few lines of the original. In conclusion, therefore, we shall add only the opening lines of each poem together with Mr. Russell's sterling translation.

I

O quotiens, filum moderata luce benignum,
  incendens flamma corpora nostra tua,
dum tremulum in vacuo lecto me Daunia cessit,
  tu nostro lusu testis amoris eras!

Generous wick with the oil of the coconut palm
Kindling each evening our own nuptial flame,
Witness you were of the love-act a number of times
[Nightly, in the city of Sfax in my youthful days,]
Till Daunia left me to shiver in an empty bed.

II

Quintilius trepido discessit languidus aestu:
  Africa prima sibi fervida causa fuit.
(Segnis enim fuerat custos hic pauperis agri)
  et tabulae damni causa timoris erant.

Quintilius has moved: he found the heat
Of Africa too much for an indolent smallholder.
Recent proscriptions also threatened him
(He said) with confiscation of his farm.

III

Dum cadere ante fores durabunt arbore grossi,
  iam tenuis, semper spes resoluta cadet.
Olim sperabam requiem mihi rure futuram
  unde mihi Bacchus lenia vina daret.

As long as the unripe figs keep dropping outside our
door
So long will my modest hopes keep falling away.
A time there was when I envisaged a future
Of peace in the country, tillage of fruitful vines.

IV

Femina Quintilio qualis nunc bella petenda est?
  Diva movit venerem vel scelerata tuam?
Vel quae iam tenuit cellas (hesternaque virgo!)
  ex grege, quem statuit Livia magna, cato?

What kind of a femina now, is it, Quintilius, you're
after?
What goddess, or baggage, engages your amorous nature?
Is it the latest recruit—some almost recently
virgin—
In the highly trained cohorts stationed in Livia's
portals?

E. N. O'Neil

University of Oregon

YOUNG HENRY JAMES: 1843-1870. By Robert C. Le Clair. New York: Bookman Associates, 1955. 469 p.

Dr. Le Clair's biography of the young Henry James covers exactly the same period as Dr. Leon Edel's study of 1953, but no two biographies could be more unlike. The difference is expressed, in part, by Dr. Le Clair himself: "A constant effort was made to avoid psychoanalysis, arbitrary interpretation, pet theories, and all the other glamorous but dangerous byways which often tempt the biographer beyond what he is able to bear" (p. 7). Such caution is exemplary. It is also, beyond a certain point, impossible. One may want to bypass Freud, but *something*, after all, must be said about the relationships between such complex souls as the elder Harry James and his two gifted sons. Relying too heavily upon Henry James' later biographical writings, Dr. Le Clair chooses to emphasize again and again the warmth of family affection that held the Jameses together. This is true, and it is refreshing to have the balance restored after Dr. Edel's resolute seeking out of submerged conflicts. But a disdain for Freudian theorizing need not prevent us from acknowledging, for example, that the elder James, torn between libertarian theories and autocratic impulses, vacillating between Europe and America partly out of a sense of his own weakness as a father, could at times be a problematical parent.

But the special contribution of Dr. Le Clair's book lies neither in its treatment of human relationships nor in the rather dogged and unoriginal criticism that he devotes to James' early stories. It is to be found in the marked resemblance it bears to such venerable excursions into literary background as *The Scott Country* and *Rambles in Dickens Land*. Dr. Le Clair's fondness for James is of the sort that sanctifies the irrelevant. Hence he seeks to recreate the world in which the James family moved in all its rich and gamy detail. The results cast little light either on James' work or his character, but Dr. Le Clair does succeed in being enjoyable and informative on such subjects as New York theater life and the history of Newport.

A final regretful word: printing and proofreading are execrable. Not only are there such minor annoyances as the failure of the typesetter to have brackets on hand, but the misplacing of lines time and again produces indecipherable chaos. And for other errors—misquotations, mistakes in fact, examples of bad usage—the carelessness of the author is responsible.

ROBERT C. GORDON

University of Oregon

INSPIRATION AND POETRY. By C. M. Bowra. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1955. viii, 266 p.

Inspiration and Poetry is a volume of twelve heterogeneous essays, as Professor Bowra confesses in the Preface. The first essay gives its title to the volume; the others deal with poets or poems as different as Horace and Hölderlin, Pushkin and Rubén Darío, Walter Pater and Gil Vicente. It is a varied offering.

"Inspiration and Poetry" seems to promise a conception of poetry which might inform the entire volume. Unfortunately, the concepts dealt with here appear only sporadically in the remainder of the book, apropos of Horace (p. 27) and Gil Vicente (p. 111), and are never central to the understanding of these poets. The essay seems too incomplete to be convincing, and concludes vaguely with the "inescapable fact" that "inspired words create new life in us because they are themselves alive" (p. 24).

The other essays vary in their approach and in the measure of their success. "The Odes of Horace" rediscovers in Horace a something ethereal that we had not quite

forgotten, but which is usually veiled by a legend of Horace we acquire or make in school. It is also refreshing to meet again the sanity of Horace's mind, "this sanity [that] informs his poetry and gives it a special flavour" (p. 44). "The Knight in the Tiger's Skin" is not an illuminating rediscovery of something old, but a presentation of something new to us. The poem is presented with clarity and order. It is accompanied by a convincing discussion of the possibility of writing about poetry written in a language one does not know. Judging by this essay on a Georgian poem, the feat is possible, with the proviso, we agree, that a translation is less inadequate in the case of narrative poetry than in the case of lyrical poetry.

"Dante and Arnaut Daniel," the essay on *Samson Agonistes*, and "Hölderlin's Hymns" are similar in that they deal with literary relations. These three studies illuminate the originality of the poets through comparison with their sources or their masters. The analyses of Milton's debt to Greek tragedy and of Hölderlin's debt to Pindar result in fresh views of *Samson Agonistes* and of the tortured soul of Hölderlin. Although the poems to Diotima are mentioned, the prose of *Hyperion* is not used to aid in an understanding of Hölderlin's religious conflicts and of his attitude towards Greece. The essays on Pushkin and Lermontov are introductory to their lives and works; they are vivid and informative. Professor Bowra has great talent of presentation; but we note a very hurried sentence in "Lermontov": "... which is one of Moore's better ventures and, if not very important or unusual, is true to its own kind of sentiment" (p. 178).

The essays on Walter Pater and Thomas Hardy are less successful. Walter Pater's intriguing personality is explored, but little that is new or illuminating is said about his works. Hardy's poetry is presented with skill, and the author's admiration for it is well reasoned. And yet we find it uncomfortable to be asked to consider as the peak of poetic achievement and the "very heart" of Hardy's "vision" the lines:

> "And as the smart ship grew
> In stature, grace, and hue,
> In shadowy silent distance grew the Iceberg too."

The two remaining essays are on Iberic subjects. The "Songs of Gil Vicente" is a delicate presentation of the extreme simplicity and sophistication of the Portuguese poet. Professor Bowra performs this most difficult of critical tasks, but mars his essay with an unjust remark on "Tirae os olhos de mim," which, he thinks, "cannot but be worsted in any such comparison" (p. 109), when read beside "Take, oh take those lips away." An English prejudice in favor of Shakespeare may be at work here, since both songs remain fresh and valid for other readers.

The essay on Rubén Darío is the weakest in the book. Professor Bowra's knowledge of Spanish appears faulty: "Son así" is translated "That's what they do" (p. 249); "pude no haber nacido" seems to be understood as a third-person singular (p. 255); "muy largo" and "muy corto" become "longer" and "shorter" (p. 254); "la princesa / que estaba triste de esperar" becomes "the princess for whom I was weary of waiting" (p. 263). Sometimes remarks are offered without proof. The "Coloquio de los Centauros," for instance, is said to have been written "perhaps with Mallarmé's 'Apres-Midi d'un Faune' in mind" (p. 249) although there is no similarity in the themes, structures, or versification of these poems. The author states that Rubén Dario "accomplishes a dazzling revival of Spanish poetry" (p. 252); yet he adds on the same page that Darío's achievement "may seem in retrospect not fully to deserve its first renown." On p. 252 Darío is said to be "far from finding an ideal comparable to Mallarmé's 'Le Néant'"; one may well find it difficult to share Professor Bowra's admiration for such an ideal. On the next page it is stated that, "When Darío speaks of sincerity, he reminds us of the great change which came over such poets as W. B. Yeats and Alexander Blok when

they gave up their first, entrancing dreams to face naked facts." We should add that Darío died at an age at which W. B. Yeats was still far from maturing into poetry.

This is a readable collection of essays, but it fails to measure up to what one should have expected from its title and of its author.

BERNARD GICOVATE

Tulane University

POETICA DEL CINQUECENTO: La "Poetica" aristotelica nei commenti essenziali degli ultimi umanisti italiani con annotazioni e un saggio introduttivo. By Galvano della Volpe. Bari: Laterza, 1954. 178 p. (Biblioteca dello Spettacolo, No. 1.)

The central portion of Galvano della Volpe's volume contains Manara Valgimigli's Italian translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* reprinted from the edition of 1946 —reprinted, not for its own sake, but as a basis for three types of addenda which Della Volpe brings into relation with the text: (1) Selected passages from the Cinquecento commentaries of Robortello, Vettori, and Castelvetro; this is the part that justifies the title, *Poetica del Cinquecento,* which in at least one of its acceptations means "Aristotle's *Poetics* as read by certain humanists of the Cinquecento." (2) Della Volpe's own commentary on the passages cited, consisting very largely of his approval of the interpretations expressed, which represent for him a "rigorous Aristotelian aesthetic" (p. 58). (3) A prefatory section of some fifty pages, entitled "Introduzione a una poetica aristotelica" and giving Della Volpe's own interpretation of the *Poetics;* this section establishes the basis for his agreement with the Cinquecento commentaries cited. One suspects that this is the most important part of the volume—as it is certainly the most original—and that the title of the volume might well be "Aristotle's *Poetics* as Read by Galvano della Volpe."

But there is an even more subtle, if nevertheless completely apparent, interrelationship among these four parts, and this interrelationship springs from the ulterior motive which Della Volpe is pursuing through the present volume. For his real intention is neither to reprint once more, bare and unchanged, a text so frequently printed before; nor merely to collect a few passages from the voluminous exegeses of the sixteenth century; nor to display his admiration for these early commentators by expressing his approval of their ideas; nor solely to present his own reading of the *Poetics* at its face value. Instead, the single conception of poetics represented by these four parts—Aristotle's text, the Cinquecento interpretations, and Della Volpe's introduction and commentary—is used to combat and contradict an opposing conception of poetics. The exaltation of "Aristotelianism" in aesthetics is meant to be, directly and overtly, a damnation of an inimical way of thinking about the art of poetry.

What Galvano della Volpe wishes to attack is, of course, "Platonism." Not Platonism in any historical sense or in any historical context, but Platonism as it exists today, as it constitutes for him the dominant form of contemporary aesthetics. By Platonism he means, in a special way, any conception of poetry to which one might apply such terms as "idealism," "romanticism," "mysticism"; any conception which is based on the notion of inspiration, of the divine furor, which believes in the universality of poetry and in its pure unity, which applies to it a unitarian criterion, one which is aprioristic and simplistic. To such a conception he would object that it is irrational and antipositivist, that it admits of no rules for the art, that it is vague and generic. One senses here a general resentment

against this kind of thinking, not only in the field of art but with respect to any other form of activity to which it might be applied.

Against any and all such conceptions, Della Volpe proposes the contrary position as he finds it in Aristotle's *Poetics*, "the anti-Platonic poetics par excellence" (p. 13). This poetics counterbalances point for point the one described under the name of Platonism. It is described by such terms as "realism," "rationalism," "positivism" (but these not abstract as in Descartes); it bases poetry upon the intellect; it is empirical, scientific, modern, makes divisions and distinctions and deals with particulars; hence it regards poetry as multiple, varied, diverse. In favor of such a conception is its rationalism and its positivism, the fact that it admits the possibility of particular and varied rules for the art, that it is concrete and specific. One senses here a general sympathy for this kind of thinking, wherever it might be applied.

Della Volpe is of course not content with a bald statement of the two contrasting positions. Most of the Introduction is devoted to a lengthy argument in which he attempts to substantiate the validity of his own position and, largely by indirection, to invalidate that of his opponents. The argument consists primarily in an interpretation of certain aspects of the *Poetics*. It concerns four subjects, in an order which may at first seem capricious but whose rationale becomes clear as we follow the argument: (1) catharsis, (2) rationality, (3) metaphors, and (4) poetry vs. nonpoetry and history (corresponding to Parts II, III, IV, and V of the Introduction).

First, the argument on catharsis: Against the Platonists who propose an aesthetico-mystical theory of catharsis, according to which it results in an "absolute aesthetic purification of the passionate and the empirical" (p. 17), Della Volpe understands catharsis as meaning "only the rational-intellectual clarification of the passions of pity and terror and their like" (p. 18). It effects a tragic sublimation of the passions by reducing them, intellectually, to images and figures; since these latter are positive, the passions are retained and objectified in all their variety and all their individuality. Moreover, catharsis has further uses and further implications; I translate: "It consists in the pleasure derived from the feelings of pity and terror purified of their excesses by the reason and reduced to a measure useful for virtue, in conformity (note well) with the general concept of the *katharsis ton pathematon* of Aristotle's own *Ethics* (Rostagni): whence truth (reason) and morality (virtue) as constitutive of art no less and no more than the feelings and the related images (*poikilia*)."[1] Thus Della Volpe justifies his selection of catharsis as a first topic of discussion, since through it he is able to relate poetics to a metaphysic of truth and to an ethic of virtue. These considerations lead him to his second argument.

The second argument revolves about the rational quality of poetry as previously found in catharsis, a rational quality which relates it to an "intellectual-discursive" universal. Since the problem of universality arises, Della Volpe is obliged to consider first Aristotle's distinction between poetry as universal and history as particular. The universality of poetry, he thinks, resides in the common or typical quality of the personages represented and of their actions—their "categoriality," their correspondence to a "truth" represented by experience. It is thus an empirical universality, with the relationships between reality and the poem expressed

[1] Page 19: "questa consiste nel piacere derivante dai sentimenti di pietà e terrore purificati dalla ragione dei loro eccessi e ridotti in misura utile per la virtù, conformemente (si badi) al concetto generale della *katharsis ton pathematon* della stessa Etica aristotelica (Rostagni): donde la verità (ragione) e la moralità (virtù) come costitutivi dell'arte non meno e non più dei sentimenti e relative immagini (la *poikilia*)."

by such terms as "necessity, possibility, probability." Taken in this way, the terms are equally applicable to poetry and to history. The same terms also refer to an internal relationship or "coherence" within the poem; and here again their applicability to poetry and to history is identical. Aristotle's distinction between poetry and history would thus seem to be incorrect or inconclusive; but Della Volpe withholds discussion of the question until he presents his fourth argument. A final related problem is that of the marvelous, which would seem at first glance to be the opposite of the probable. Della Volpe argues that this is not true, and that the marvelous in a poem is itself subject to the internal coherence, to the rationality and the intellectuality of the internal structure.

All these problems of catharsis, of universality, and of internal coherence are found in an especially acute form in connection with the problem of the metaphor, discussed in Della Volpe's third argument. The difficulty is that here again we seem to find no basis for distinction between poetry and nonpoetry. The metaphor, as an indispensable intellectual instrument, as a medium of cognition and of expression, is common to both. It is always logical and positive, requiring as it does a capacity to recognize similarities and differences, to relate particulars to their genus, to define. Like catharsis, like action and character, it is concrete, empirical, universal; like them, also, it is a nexus which unites experience and poetry, truth and the symbols of literature. As the instrument most proper to poetry, it partakes of the latter's rationality and truth. The important question then arises whether there may not be some special way of using the metaphor in poetry which would be different from its uses in "prose" or in science, and this leads Della Volpe to his final argument, that concerning the distinction between poetry and nonpoetry.

Aristotle's criteria for distinguishing artistic from nonartistic errors are reduced by Galvano della Volpe to a single positive criterion for poetry, "credibility as an internal necessity of the work." This is synonymous with rationality, necessity, probability in their broadest artistic sense. But these qualities would not serve to differentiate poetry from history, since they are common to both. Nor may the two be distinguished on the basis of moral utility, "given the concrete ethicity which results from the rational (common) catharsis of feelings and passions and passionate prejudices" (p. 39). The answer is to be found rather in a technical characteristic of the poetic work, in the specific way in which it uses our common experience and our human conscience. We discover that poetic credibility and the nature of the language used are indistinguishable; that is, the form of the work is conditioned by the technico-semantic element. There is an "organicity" or unity of expression in a poem, identical with its unity of form, which is not to be found in historical or scientific works. Within this unity, each word or symbol is given a special meaning which it has only here, only in the complex of the words which make up the poem. Internal credibility is a function of this semantic necessity. Once again, this semantic self-sufficiency is a positive quality, a kind of reality or truth; the criterion is, once again, nonaprioristic, nondogmatic, nonabsolutist; it is scientific, rational, concrete, eminently Aristotelian.

If we may reduce the whole of the argument somewhat brutally, it would seem that the discussion of catharsis, leading to considerations of truth and morality, provides no basis for separating poetry from nonpoetry; that the discussion of rationality, leading to considerations of experience and common humanity, is equally unsuccessful; that the discussion of metaphors, although it discovers further similarities between poetry and nonpoetry, nevertheless brings us nearer to the final clarification insofar as it informs us with respect to the most peculiarly poetic instrument of expression; and that this final clarification consists in a reduction of poetic form—with all its implications—to a matter of language and semantics.

I have given this lengthy statement of Della Volpe's argument for two reasons: first, because the argument in the Introduction itself is so obscured by hermetic writing, by philosophical jargon, and by a multiplicity of parentheses as to make interpretation difficult; second, because I wish now to express some doubts about the "Aristotelianism" of his theory—the quality which for him makes it original and valid. I shall do so by indicating, for each of the four arguments, the possibility of a different way of reading the *Poetics*, one which would make his suggestions untenable. I shall do so not out of any desire to defend the "enemy" position of the "Platonists," but rather from the conviction that the whole statement of the problem of poetic theory as a battle between "Platonists" and "Aristotelians" is a useless and essentially erroneous one.

Let us consider first the question of catharsis. Rather than seeing in catharsis a "rational-intellectual clarification of the passions" having implications for both truth and morality, I should like to propose that, for Aristotle in the *Poetics*, the "effect" of tragedy described by the term "catharsis" is purely artistic and has implications only for the structure of the poem and for the immediate reaction of the audience as occasioned by that structure. Simply stated (and without going into the justifications which would involve a total reading of the *Poetics*), this means that, if the plot of the tragedy is properly constructed, the audience will be aroused to certain passions which, as the plot develops and concludes, will be clarified and removed. Such a reading is, I believe, more in keeping with Aristotle's insistence upon the primary importance of plot in the structure of tragedy (an importance which Della Volpe passes over completely) and with the whole method of the *Poetics*, which is concerned rather with the structure of poems than with their relationships to other sciences such as metaphysics and ethics.

Similar considerations of method would lead me to reject Della Volpe's second argument, tending as it does to find the "rationality" of poetry in characters and actions which are "common" or "typical" and to define verisimilitude and possibility in terms of reference to a common human experience. These again should be conceived in terms of the poetic structure itself, with character and action made "necessary" and "probable" only by previous statements in the work itself, without reference to an external reality except insofar as poetry is an imitation and represents external reality in its own special way, and with verisimilitude as a criterion provided separately and specifically by each poem. The "marvelous" in this reading is that which does not correspond to common notions of verisimilitude but which is nevertheless made probable in the poem, and the impossible probable is the same thing. I am willing to accept Della Volpe's definition of necessity as an "internal coherence" of the work, but this must be thought of in terms of a broader view of plot and characters than he admits and not in terms of the "semantic necessity" which he ultimately proposes. The "universality" which he equates with "typicity" is found rather in the fact that, when character and circumstances (within a poem) are established in a given way, there is an expectation that certain kinds of action and certain particular actions will follow in the same poem. As for "rationality," I shall speak of this at a later point.

To Della Volpe's third argument, which makes of the metaphor an instrument that once again links poetry to truth and to experience—hence rational and positive —I should present these major objections: In the *Poetics*, all considerations of diction and of the metaphor itself are subordinated to matters of plot, character, and thought, for which diction supplies the means of expression and to which diction is auxiliary in the hierarchy of the structural parts. That is, the criteria for expression are derived from the needs of the things expressed. Della Volpe completely destroys this hierarchical order, taking the metaphor in itself and finding its criteria outside the poem in certain intellectual operations. He himself admits that this pro-

cedure leads to no sure distinction between poetry and nonpoetry; but he nevertheless allows this step in his argument to produce the final distinction, which must therefore of necessity be a linguistic and a rhetorical one.

My objection to the fourth argument is hence the same as my objection to the third. Admitting with Della Volpe that what distinguishes poetry from nonpoetry is a certain kind of internal structure, I should nevertheless insist that for Aristotle it is not a structure in which words determine one another but rather one in which all the words are "determined" by the higher parts in the structure, thought, character, and plot. In the *Poetics*, the highest organizing principle of such a genre as tragedy is the plot; all other parts are subordinate and auxiliary to it. For Della Volpe, plot and the other intermediate parts are nonexistent. Hence his theory becomes—and he labels it as such—a semantic or linguistic rather than a poetic one as Aristotle would understand it.

There is, behind what I should consider to be the faults of interpretation, an even graver one of a philosophical order, one which is involved in Della Volpe's own method. In his eagerness to discredit the "Platonists" and their way of thinking and to praise the "Aristotelians" (his Cinquecento commentators) and their way of thinking, he loses sight of the fact that he is dealing with "ways of thinking" and proceeds to talk about "things" themselves. Thus, for him a poem is a logical, rationalistic, positive "thing" (all the other epithets may be added *ad libitum*), a metaphor is a "thing" of the same kind, so is catharsis and character and action. "Rationality" is a quality of poetry rather than of the critic's mind or of his method. These are all thus "Aristotelian things" rather than "Platonic things"; and the Aristotelians are right because they see them as they are while the Platonists are wrong because they see them as they are not. But Aristotelianism and Platonism are methods of analysis rather than ways of being. One and the same existing thing may be analyzed, properly and correctly, in the context of a Platonic method and in the context of an Aristotelian method. Different things will be said about it in each, since the points of departure and the intermediate steps and the points of arrival will be different for each. But the thing itself will not have changed, will not have become Platonic or Aristotelian. By committing this error, Della Volpe adds another one to the mistakes of the Cinquecento commentators whom he esteems so highly and with whom he agrees so wholly. For if theirs was a bad Aristotelianism because it misunderstood and deformed the text of the *Poetics*, his is a bad Aristotelianism because it misunderstands the basic principles of method involved in any Aristotelian—or, as far as that is concerned, in any Platonic—analysis.

BERNARD WEINBERG

University of Chicago

VARIA

BOOKS RECEIVED

Astre, Georges-Albert. Thèmes et structures dans l'œuvre de John Dos Passos. Paris: Lettres Modernes, 1956. 212 p.

Bishop, John Lyman. The Colloquial Short Story in China. A study of the San-Yen Collections. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956. xi, 144 p.

Bredvold, Louis., Alan D. McKillop, and Lois Whitney (editors). Eighteenth Century Poetry and Prose. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1956. xxvii, 1274 p.

Cady, E. H., F. J. Hoffman, R. H. Pearce (editors). The Growth of American Literature: A Critical and Historical Survey. Vol. I. New York: American Book Co., 1956. xvi, 911 p.

Caracciolo, Alberto. La persona e il tempo. Parte prima. Arona: Paideia, 1955. 105 p.

Cecchetti, Giovanni. La poesia del Pascoli. Pisa: Liberia Goliardica, 1954. 147 p.

Corrigan, Beatrice (editor). Curious Annals: New Documents Relating to Browning's Roman Murder Story. Translated, edited, and with an introduction. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956. l, 142 p.

Dédéyan, Charles. Le Thème de Faust dans la littérature européenne. Paris: Lettres Modernes, 1955. 329 p.

English Miscellany: A Symposium of History, Literature and the Arts. Editor Mario Praz. Vol. VI. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1955. 257 p.

Escarpit, Robert. Rudyard Kipling. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1955. 251 p.

Figueiredo, Fidelino de. Viagem através da Espanha literária. Rio de Janeiro, 1951. 106 p.

Freeman, William. A Concise Dictionary of English Slang. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. 268 p.

Gilman, Stephen. The Art of La Celestina. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956. x, 261 p.

González, Manuel Pedro. José María Heredia, primogénito del romanticismo hispano: Ensayo de rectificación histórica. Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1955. 159 p.

Grossman, Rudolf, Walter Pabst, Edmund Schramm (editors). Der Vergleich: literatur- und sprachwissenschaftliche Interpretationen. Festgabe für Hellmuth Petriconi. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co., 1955.

Howell, Wilbur Samuel. Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956. x, 411 p.

Hughes, Leo. A Century of English Farce. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956. vi, 307 p.

Kelso, Ruth. Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956. ix, 475 p.

Kenner, Hugh. Dublin's Joyce. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956. xii, 372 p.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. The Classics and Renaissance Thought. Cambridge, Mass.: Published for Oberlin College by Harvard University Press, 1955. x, 106 p. (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. XV.)

Ledig, Gert. The Tortured Earth: A Novel of the Russian Front. Translated by Mervyn Savill. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1956. 219 p.

Leyburn, Ellen D. Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956. vii, 142 p.

Liu Wu-Chi. Confucius, His Life and Time. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. xviii, 189 p.

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED
LIBRARY
AUG 18 1956
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Luomala, Katharine. Voices on the Wind: Polynesian Myths and Chants. Illustrated by Joseph Feher. Bishop Museum Press, 1955. vi, 191 p.

Mahabharata of Vyasa Krishna Dwaipayana. Selections from The Adi Parva and The Sambha Parva. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. xii, 205 p.

Molière. Six Prose Comedies: An English Version by George Graveley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. viii, 378 p.

Montesquieu. De l'Esprit des Loix. Texte établi et présenté par Jean Brethe de la Gressaye. Tome II. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955. xlvi, 465 p.

Morrissette, Bruce. The Great Rimbaud Forgery: The Affair of La Chasse spirituelle. With unpublished documents and an anthology of Rimbaldian pastiches. Saint Louis: Washington University Studies, 1956. viii, 333 p.

Oppel, Horst. Studien zur Auffassung des Nordischen in der Goethezeit. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1944. 243 p.

Patsch, Howard Rollin. El otro mundo en la literatura medieval. Seguido de un Apéndice: La visión de trasmundo en las literaturas hispánicas por María Rosa Lida de Malkiel. Mexico City and Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1956. 471 p.

Pokorny, Jaroslav. Shakespeare in Czechoslovakia. Prague: Orbis, 1955. 67 p.

Praz, Mario. The Hero in Eclipse in Victorian Fiction. Translated from the Italian by Angus Davidson. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1956. vi, 478 p.

Preveden, Francis R. A History of the Croatian People. Vol. I, Prehistory and Early Period until 1397 A.D. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 134 p., 64 pl.

Rabelais. Pages choisies. Ed. Fernand Flutre. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1947. 96 p.

Renzulli, Michele. Johns Keats, l'uomo e il poeta. Rome: Francesco Giordano, 1956. 468 p.

Rimbaud, Arthur. Pages choisies. Ed. H. de Bouillane de Lacoste. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1955. 96 p.

Rose, William. Heinrich Heine: Two Studies of his Thought and Feeling. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. vii, 163 p.

Rossetti, Christina. Poems. Selected and arranged by Kathleen Jarvis. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. xii, 106 p.

Rousseaux, André. Le Monde classique. Vol. IV. Paris: Albin Michel, 1956. 262 p.

Royo, Rodrigo. The Sun and the Snow. Translated by Anthony Kerrigan. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1956. 304 p.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Second Congress of the Associazione Internazionale per gli Studi di Lingua e Letteratura Italiana will be held at Venice and Padua September 26-30, 1956. Information may be obtained from Professor Vittore Branca of the University of Padua.

The *Pound Newsletter*, edited by Professor John Edwards (Berkeley), has completed its scheduled ten issues and has ceased publication.

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
AUG 18 1956
MANHATTAN
KANSAS